

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup>. XI. APRIL 1878.

---

ART. I.—LEGAL EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE ON  
THE PETRINE CLAIMS.

1. *Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster.* By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The See of S. Peter.* By T. W. ALLIES. (London, 1850.)
3. *The Evidence for the Papacy, as derived from the Holy Scriptures and from Primitive Antiquity.* By the Hon. COLIN LINDSAY. (London, 1870.)
4. *The Privilege of Peter and the Claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves.* By ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A. (London, 1875.)

THE death of Pius IX., the Pontiff under whose auspices was completed the building of Papal autocracy in spiritual matters, planned, in part at least, by Pope Nicolas I. more than a thousand years ago, carried on by the genius of Gregory VII., by the lofty ambition of Innocent III., by the more worldly policy of Boniface VIII., and diligently laboured at ever since the first beginning of the counter-reformation by the persistent toil of the Jesuit body from Bellarmine to Franzelin, prompts a survey of the heritage he has bequeathed to his successor, to whom he failed to hand down the temporal crown he wore himself. One thing is clear, that the Papal claims can be practically advanced no further, as their logical goal has been attained, and those controversial debates which

VOL. VI.—NO. XI.

B

370609

formerly ranged over almost the whole domain of theology must be henceforward concentrated on one topic alone, since whatever is found existing uncensured in the Latin Obedience must be regarded as having the sanction of infallibility at its back, and as being therefore unassailable by loyal Catholics within the fold, and by all external opponents who are not prepared to join issue on the preliminary question. And, notably, the controversy between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, though it has not really changed since it originally began, has been limited, since the Vatican Council of 1870, to one definite issue, so far as Roman Catholic controversialists are concerned. That issue is the formal claim, first openly put forward by Boniface VIII. in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*, that the Roman Church is not merely 'the mother and mistress of all Churches,' the largest, most august, and most authoritative portion of the Christian body, occupying, so to speak, the position of the eldest son who succeeds to the titles and to the entailed estates of his father—albeit the younger have minor independent legacies bequeathed to them—but that she is the *whole* Church, the sole legitimate offspring and heir, so that wherever in the course of Holy Scripture or of the Fathers 'the Church' is spoken of as clothed with any graces or privileges, the meaning is absolutely limited to the Church in communion with and under the authority of the Pope of Rome, and excludes all other Christian societies as mere sects and schisms from the unity of the One Body of Christ. All other pleas which are raised by Roman controversialists against other portions of Christendom are purely incidental and subordinate, whether urged against their orthodoxy, their possession of a valid ministry, or their practical working. No unimpeachability on all these heads makes the least difference in the conduct of the Roman Church towards them. In every case her policy is the same—to enter on their domains, to deny their claims and rights, and to substitute a rival organisation and worship for that which she finds established amongst them. This conduct she justifies on the alleged ground of superior right, conferred by special Divine privilege, and proved by the clear witness of revelation, as well in Holy Scripture as in the historical tradition of Christendom.

It will simplify the inquiry to set down the latest authoritative utterances on the subject, as embodied in the decrees of the Vatican Council itself:—

1. 'Supernatural Revelation, according to the faith of the Universal Church, as declared by the Holy Council of Trent, is contained



in written books and in the unwritten traditions, which, having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or having been, as it were, handed down from the Apostles themselves at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have arrived even unto us.'—(*Conc. Trid. Sess. iv., Decr. de Can. Script.*)

2. 'And these entire books of the Old and New Testament, with all their parts, as they are set forth in the decrees of the said Council, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition, are to be received as holy and canonical. These the Church holds to be holy and canonical, not because, having been compiled by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself. . . . That is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which Holy Mother Church hath held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Holy Scripture, and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret Holy Scripture contrary to this sense, nor, likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'—(*Conc. Vatic. Sess. iii. cap. 2.*)

The last clause is somewhat obscurely worded, and it is well to cite in explanation the slightly different wording of the third clause of the Tridentine Profession of Faith, commonly called the Creed of Pius IV., which runs thus:—

'I also admit Holy Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; *neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*'

This creed has to be formally professed by all bishops and clergy in the Roman Church, and by all lay converts who are sufficiently educated to understand it.

What we have established so far is, that any claim or privilege, in order to be accounted Divine in the Church of Rome, and warranted by Revelation, must be based (a) on Holy Scripture, (b) on the historical tradition of the Church, (c) on the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers. This excludes all visions and quasi-revelations, as also expressions of ecclesiastical opinion later than the time of S. Bernard, who is accounted the last of the Fathers, and who died in 1153, as evidence of *Divine* right, which must be proved by these three concurrent testimonies.

The claims set forward in the Vatican decrees on the Constitution of the Church are as follow:—

1. 'If any one shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not

appointed by Christ the Lord the Prince of all the Apostles, and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant; or that he received a primacy of honour only, and not directly or immediately one of true and proper jurisdiction from the same our Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.'

2. 'If any should say that it is not by the institution of Christ the Lord Himself, or by Divine right, that blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the Church Universal, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy, let him be anathema.'

3. 'None may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is none greater; nor can any lawfully review its judgment; therefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs to a General Council, or to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff. If then, any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, but not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses only the chief part, and not the entire fulness of the supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches, and over each and all the pastors and faithful, let him be anathema.'

4. 'The Sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when discharging the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Church Universal, by the Divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one—which God avert—presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.'

In proportion as these claims are vast and startling, the proofs alleged need to be abundant, clear, and conclusive, and every step in the process must be rigorously established by convincing evidence of its Divine origin and institution, as distinguished from mere ecclesiastical powers of human arrangement and concession. For the claim is that it is nothing less than divinely revealed, and that not by any such visions and miracles as are alleged on behalf of particular devotional practices in modern times, but by the threefold testimony of Scripture, Church history, and the writings of the Fathers.

Further, as the entire claim of Papal Infallibility rests

avowedly on asserted heirship to S. Peter, and right of succession to all his privileges, while no allegation is made that those privileges have been specifically re-granted to any Pope since his time, much less increased, developed, and amplified in any manner, it follows that the Pope can claim no more than is plainly discoverable as conferred upon and exercised by S. Peter himself. But the whole of the evidence now extant upon this head is confined to the books of the New Testament. The few meagre and uncertain notices of S. Peter's life which have come to us from uninspired writers do not touch this question of his primacy, jurisdiction, and transmission of his powers at all. Consequently, the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles contain not only his whole charter of privilege, but our whole means of ascertaining what he actually enjoyed and exercised in virtue of that charter.

For the Roman claims, then, to have any firm basis, this evidence must establish clearly and expressly, and not by mere possible implication, the following points:—

1. That S. Peter was given by Christ a primacy, not of honour and rank only, but of direct and sovereign jurisdiction over all the other Apostles.

2. That this primacy was not limited to S. Peter's person only, for his lifetime, but was conferred on him with power to bequeath it to his successors. The subsequent question, as to whether he did actually so bequeath it to the Bishops of Rome, belongs to a later date in Church history than that comprised in the New Testament period, and must be deferred for the present. It is our business now to examine the charter, conveyance, and exercise of that which in the language of modern Roman theologians is called the 'Privilege of Peter.' The reason why the proof of it needs to be express and clear, is because *privilege*, being a private exception to the usual public course of law, either in the form of exemption from some burden generally imposed, or of enjoyment of some benefit generally refused, is essentially an invidious thing, and requires fuller proof than any other right before it can be allowed as valid. Consequently the Roman Canon Law (by which a Roman claim cannot refuse to be tested) has laid down the following broad rules (amongst others) to govern all cases of the sort:—

1. The authoritative document containing the privilege must be produced.—(*Decret. Greg. IX. lib. v. tit. xxxiii.*)

2. Its wording must be certain and manifest, not obscure or doubtful.—(*Decret. Greg. IX., lib. v. tit. xl. 25.*)

3. It must be construed in the most strict and literal

sense.—(*Reg. Juris*. vi. and xxviii.; *Fagnan. de Past. et Prælat.* 7; *Zyphæus de Privil. Consult.* 1.)

4. If personal, it follows the person [not the office]; and it dies with the person named in it.—(*Boniface VIII. De Regulis Juris. reg.* vii.)

5. It may not be extended to any other person, because of identity or similarity of reason, unless such extension be expressly named in it.—(*Decret. Greg. IX. lib. v. tit. xxxiii. 9.*)

6. It may not be so interpreted as to deny, interfere with, or encroach upon the rights and privileges of another.—(*Decret. Greg. IX. lib. v. tit. xxxiii. 4.*)

7. It is forfeited by any excess or abuse in its exercise. (*Decret. ii. xi. 3. lx.*)

Let us now examine the evidence of Holy Scripture, not mainly from a theological point of view, but rather from a legal one, as the principal document tendered in proof of claim. Our Lord's charter to S. Peter is held to be contained in three clauses of the Gospels:—

1. 'And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'—S. Matthew xvi. 17-19.

2. 'And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.'—S. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

3. 'So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved, because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep.'—S. John xxi. 15-17.

This is the sum of the charter. If we look somewhat more minutely into it, we shall find that certain portions of it are not peculiar to S. Peter, but are common to others. First, we are told that in the interval between S. Peter's

going away to pay the tribute-money for Christ and himself (S. Matthew xvii. 27) and his return to the other Apostles, when he put his question to Christ on the forgiveness of injuries, Our Lord conferred the same power of the Keys on the remaining Apostles, apart from S. Peter, saying—

‘Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’—S. Matthew xviii. 18;

and again bestowed it on all the Apostles collectively, after His Resurrection—

‘Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you : as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.’—S. John xx. 21-23.

Accordingly, the clause as to the Keys in S. Matthew xvi. 19 is no part of the especial *privilege* of Peter, and constitutes no difference between him and the remaining Apostles.

The second passage, that from S. Luke, so far from exalting S. Peter, actually puts him below the level of his colleagues, as the context shows. All of them are to be tried and sifted by Satan like wheat. Peter is the only one whose actual fall and denial of his Lord is foretold—cowardly flight being the worst fault of the other Apostles—and thus he is the only one who stands in need of ‘conversion.’ And he is bidden, when this necessary repentance and change have taken place in himself, to support, by his newly-revived zeal, his yet unfallen brethren, lest they should sin as he had just done. To fortify them by confession of his own weakness is in no respect akin to exercising authority over them.

The third passage (apart from the difficulty that in the only one place of Holy Writ where the Apostles are spoken of as ‘sheep’ S. Peter is included amongst them, and not separately named as their shepherd :—‘Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves’—S. Matthew x. 16) in like manner confers no exceptional privilege, because we have it twice attributed to the ordinary ministers of the Church—the Elders, far below the Apostles in power and dignity, while one of these two attributions is made by S. Peter himself. The clauses are, first, S. Paul’s address to the Elders of the Church at Miletus :—

‘Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the

church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.'—Acts xx. 28 ;

and next, S. Peter's similar exhortation :—

'The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed : Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly ; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind ; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.'—1 S. Peter v. 1-3.

And, in truth, part of the immediate context of S. John xxi. 17, which has been generally overlooked in this connexion, furnishes incidental but adequate disproof of the Ultramontane gloss :—

'Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following ; which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee ? Peter seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do ? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ? follow thou Me.'—S. John xxi. 20-22.

It is obvious that if S. Peter had received jurisdiction over S. John only a few minutes before, his question was perfectly legitimate and reasonable, and merited a reply, as being his concern, because affecting one for whom he had been just made responsible. But the answer he actually receives can denote nothing short of S. John's entire independence, and the restriction of S. Peter's own commission to attending to his own specific and limited share of Apostolic work, with no right of control over S. John.

There remains therefore, so far, as the whole charter of special Petrine privilege, only the one verse :—

'And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'—S. Matthew xvi. 18.

But, before we enter on the question of its interpretation, to be considered later, it appears that even it does not stand alone in such sort as to constitute a gift of sovereign authority. For this same attribute of being foundations of the Church is in two other places ascribed to the Apostles generally, once by S. Paul :—

'Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone ; in Whom all the building fitly



framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.'—Eph. i. 19-21;

and again by S. John:—

'And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.'—Rev. xxi. 14;

where, moreover, it is not unworthy of notice, that the *first* stone, a jasper, is much inferior in beauty and value to some of the remainder, as the sapphire, emerald, and chrysolite, which severally form the second, fourth, and seventh foundations.—Rev. xxi. 19-20.

Nevertheless, as the whole New Testament ought, for the purposes of this inquiry, be construed as a single document, there may be other expressions and indications in it from which the extent of the Petrine charter may be reasonably inferred, and if a collation of them give any more specific authority to S. Peter than is visible thus far, it must be read into and incorporated with that charter. Conversely, if the additional evidence point to a strict and narrow construction, or even to further limitation, of it, that too must needs be taken as conditioning its terms.

The first piece of evidence, then, is that *immediately after* the bestowal by Christ of whatever gift or privilege is conferred by S. Matthew xvi. 18-19, and most probably in the course of the very same conversation, as appears from a comparison of S. Mark viii. 27-34, by far the sternest rebuke ever uttered to an Apostle by Christ falls on S. Peter:—

'From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee. But He turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art an offence unto Me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.'—S. Matthew xvi. 21-23.

This proves at the least that S. Peter did not acquire in virtue of that previous charter the gift of infallibility, nor even that of not directly contravening the will of God. And so evident is this deduction, that a modern infallibilist has endeavoured to escape from it by alleging that the Peter of the second clause was a different person from the Simon Bar-jona or Peter of the first one.

Next, if the passage in question be, as it is from a Roman Catholic point of view, one of the most significant and im-

portant items of Divine revelation, we are entitled to expect to find it emphasised by the other Evangelists.

If it lay outside their plan, and they made no reference whatever to this conversation at Cæsarea Philippi, no conclusion either way could be drawn from their silence, any more than from S. John's omission of the Last Supper or the Ascension.

But S. Mark and S. Luke both do embody S. Peter's confession of Christ in their narratives, yet leave out entirely all reference to the words 'Thou art Peter,' &c.,—S. Mark. viii. 27-34, S. Luke ix. 18-23. Hence it is clear that in their minds the important part of the conversation was the declaration of our Lord's person and office, not the definition and scope of S. Peter's privilege. Nor is this all. The received tradition of the Roman Church is that S. Mark was the disciple of S. Peter, and wrote his Gospel by S. Peter's directions and under his supervision. But S. Mark, while *omitting* the words 'Thou art Peter,' &c., *inserts* the words 'Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.'—S. Mark viii. 33.

The inevitable inference from this most weighty fact is that S. Peter himself did not consider the words of Christ in S. Matthew xvi. 17-20 necessary to be communicated by S. Mark to those for whom his Gospel was written, and therefore it is clear that he did not attach the meaning to them which Roman controversialists now allege as the true one, since, had he done so, he was bound for the highest reasons to make his peculiar commission known, precisely as an ambassador is required to produce his credentials, and the governor of a colony to exhibit his patent from the Crown, at his entry upon his office. Nor can such a breach of duty as silence under such circumstances be excused by attributing it to S. Peter's humility, because the truest humility is implicit obedience to God's commands, whether tending to exalt or abase him to whom the command is given.

Further, S. Peter uses language in his own Epistles which implies, if not ignorance on his part as to any special privilege attaching to his own person, at any rate abstinence from pressing it, and that to the extent of employing phrases which seem to exclude it, so far as it is held to be based either on S. Matthew xvi. 18, or on S. John xxi. 15-17. For in the first place, he seems to recognise no foundation of the Church save Christ Himself:—

‘If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious. To Whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen

of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious : and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded.'—1 S. Peter ii. 3-6.

And in the next place he names only one Chief Shepherd and Bishop—

'Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness : by Whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray ; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.'—1 Peter ii. 24, 25.

With this may be contrasted the language of Pius IX., who, in a public address, applied to himself the text S. John xiv. 6.—'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,' words which cannot by any accommodation be applied save to Him Who spoke them, as two of them denote incommunicable attributes ; whereas S. Peter might have found justification for claiming the titles of 'Foundation of the Church' and 'Chief Shepherd,' as his own, had he thought they belonged to him.

The next question to consider is, what additional light the language of our Lord in the Gospels sheds on the extent and nature of the privilege of Peter. First, then, soon after the utterance in S. Matthew xvi. 18, and just before the bestowal of the power of the keys on all the Apostles in S. Peter's absence, the question of precedence in Christ's kingdom is raised, and is answered by our Lord in terms inconsistent with the opinion that the disciples understood Him to have already settled that point, or that He had in fact done so, whether they understood Him or not :—

'At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven ? And Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.'—S. Matt. xviii. 1-4.

A little later Christ puts all the Apostles on the same level :—

'Then answered Peter and said unto Him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed Thee ; what shall we have therefore ? And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'—S. Matt. xix. 27, 28.

This text has a further bearing on the question, as establishing that Christ's grants are conditional and forfeitable, not indefeasible, since one of the twelve to whom these words were spoken was Judas Iscariot.

Thirdly, comes the application of the mother of SS. James and John on behalf of her children:—

‘Then came to Him the mother of Zebedee’s children with her sons, worshipping Him, and desiring a certain thing of Him. And He said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto Him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on Thy right hand, and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And He saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of My cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on My right hand, and on My left, is not Mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father. And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto Him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.’—S. Matt. xx. 20–28.

Here it is to be noticed that the request of Salome was not for a mere honorary distinction, but for substantial office and authority, since in Eastern kingdoms, even to this day, the two principal ministers of State ranking next in authority to the monarch are styled ‘Vizir of the right hand’ and ‘Vizir of the left hand.’ Obviously, Christ’s answer, on the Roman hypothesis, must have been that He had already given away the right-hand post to S. Peter, and did not intend to create a left-hand one. What He does say is to declare explicitly that no one of them should exercise authority over the others, consequently that He had *not* given S. Peter any jurisdiction over the Apostolic college.

Nevertheless, so persistent amongst the Twelve was the carnal way of viewing Christ’s kingdom as modelled on the pattern of earthly monarchies, that this very same question crops up again at the Last Supper—a time when a peculiar solemnity and sacredness attaches to every word of Christ, and when, if ever, we might expect Him to nominate the chief who should rule His Church after His departure. What

we do find, however, is a precise reiteration of His former explanation, a renewal of His former promise of equal dignity:—

‘And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest. And He said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth. Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’—S. Luke xxii. 24–30.

After supper, He says, still marking their perfect equality, ‘I am the vine, ye are the branches.’—S. John xv. 5.

The last utterance of Christ which directly bears upon the question of privilege is the final commission to the Apostles before the Ascension:—

‘Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him; but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world, Amen.’—S. Matt. xxviii. 16–20.

Here, as before, no distinction is made between them, and no hint is given that they should look to S. Peter as their chief.

There is, however, yet another important saying of our Lord’s which touches the subject from another side, and not less significantly.

It is to be remembered, that as the Gospel is the harmonious development and spiritual fulfilment of the typical Mosaic Law, we are entitled to look for some parallel in the Gospel for every salient type or incident under the Law, with, however, this weighty and invariable difference, that the anti-type is never *identical* with the type, but belongs to a less carnal and more spiritual order, so that there is never an exact reproduction of the earlier ordinance; as the Holy Eucharist, when compared with the animal sacrifices, exemplifies, and still more the substitution of Christ for the Levitical High Priests (Heb. vi. 20; vii. 15–28; viii. 1–6). Now the two

greatest Old Testament types of Christ are Moses, as law-giver and prophet, and David, as king and prophet. Each of these takes measures to appoint his successor before his own death, and to secure his acceptance by the nation. The delegation by Moses to Joshua is recorded in Numbers xxvii. 15-23, and in Deut. xxxi. 23; the action of David is recorded in 1 Kings i. 32-35; and in each case the action is most formal and explicit.

Now these two examples have three points in common: (a) they take place just before the deaths of the chief actors; (b) they are express and unambiguous in their designation of the successor's name; (c) they are attended by public ceremonial solemnities. And we are justified, by the analogy of faith, in looking for some cognate action on Christ's part, only this analogy would be violated, not observed, by a precise agreement in the human element of the proceeding.

Accordingly, we do find it, and exactly in the higher plane to be expected. On the night before His death, Christ formally designates His Vicar on earth, and that in the most precise and definite terms, to the necessary exclusion of any other:—

‘And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. . . . But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. . . . But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me. . . . Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you. . . . Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and show it unto you.’—S. John xiv. 16, 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13, 14, 15.

The formal installation of this Vicar of Christ is also recorded:—

‘And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house



where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.'—Acts ii. 1-4.

The parallel thus holds good in all the three particulars common to the appointment of Joshua and Solomon, besides fulfilling the further condition essential to its Gospel character, of belonging to a higher order of things, inasmuch as a Divine Being—not a mere man, however commissioned—is sent to occupy the place of the departed lawgiver and king. The nomination of any Apostle would have left the act of Christ on exactly the same level as those of Moses and David,—or rather, on a much lower one, since the interval between Him and S. Peter is much vaster than that between Moses and Joshua, or David and Solomon—and thus it would have provided no real anti-type for the type and shadow under the old Covenant.

This being so, to demand, much more to constitute, what the Vatican Council styles a 'Visible Head of the Church Militant' is, in effect, to refuse the Head so nominated and appointed by Christ, and to commit the sin of the Jews when they twice rejected the Lord because of His invisibility, desiring some object of worship and some leader more cognisable by the senses, saying first to Aaron :—

'Up, make us gods, which shall go before us ; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.'—Exodus xxxii. 1 ;

and later, when demanding a king, in order to be like the nations round them, as recorded in 1 Sam. viii. 4-7.

This closes the evidence derivable from *words* of our Lord in the Gospels as to any peculiar charter of privilege bestowed on S. Peter. But *acts*, in such a matter, would be equally valid as testimony, and must also be taken into account. Our next step, therefore, is to ascertain what direct personal distinctions are, by the immediate *action* of Christ Himself, conferred on S. Peter, and recorded in the Gospels. They are as follows :—

1. S. Peter's name stands *first* in the three lists of the Apostles given in the synoptic Gospels, S. Matt. x. 2 ; S. Mark iii. 16 ; S. Luke vi. 15. This, coupled with the fact that the name of Judas Iscariot stands *last* in these same three lists, points to a priority of some kind, albeit not defined clearly.

2. He is chosen as a companion and witness to Christ on three important occasions, from which the general body of the Apostles was excluded, (a) the Transfiguration—S. Matt.

xvii. 1; S. Mark ix. 2; S. Luke ix. 28; (b) the raising of Jairus's daughter—S. Mark v. 37; S. Luke viii. 51; (c) the Agony in the Garden—S. Matt. xxvi. 37; S. Mark xiv. 33.

3. He is directed to pay the tribute money for Christ and himself, and is thus specially coupled with our Lord.

4. He is sent to prepare the upper chamber for the Passover—S. Luke xxii. 8. These are all the instances discoverable.

(i.) As to the first of these distinctions, S. Peter's priority in the lists of Apostles, where we might naturally look in his stead either for the name of S. Andrew, as the first called of the Twelve, and himself the first to call another to Christ (S. John i. 40, 41), or else of S. John, because of his special prerogative as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (S. John xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20), undoubtedly denotes some precedence, and were any jurisdiction over the other Apostles attributed to S. Peter elsewhere, it would serve as collateral evidence in proof of his claim. But the entire silence of the Gospels on this head forbids us to read any such clause into the statement, and shows that, instead of the order of the lists serving as a key to interpret the remainder of the notices concerning S. Peter in the Gospels, it must itself be interpreted by them, if the extent of S. Peter's privilege be inferred from the information they supply. In the analogy of any cognate lists, so far as Holy Scripture is concerned—such as those in Genesis, Numbers, and Chronicles—only genealogical order of seniority is denoted, and no difference of authority over the deacons appears in the case of S. Stephen (Acts vi. 5), nor over the Seven Churches in that of the Angel of the Church of Ephesus (Rev. i. 2, ii. 1); while in lists belonging to civil life, say, for example, such as the roll of English dukes, the order denotes merely social precedence, not inequality of rank and honour, far less official superiority, and the subordination of all the lower names on the roll to the authority of that which stands first. There are, moreover, two items of evidence discoverable in the lists of the Apostles, which materially weaken the argument drawn from the order of the names. They are that, unquestionably, S. James and S. John occupy a more prominent place in the Gospels than any other Apostle except S. Peter himself, and seemingly enjoy some degree of priority. But in two out of the three lists (S. Matt. x. 2, and S. Luke vi. 14), S. Andrew is placed next after S. Peter, and described as his brother, while in S. Mark's Gospel alone, chap. iii. 16, 17, is the actual order of rank observed, and the qualifying description of S. Andrew omitted—another

incidental proof of S. Peter's care not to magnify his office. In like manner, S. Matthew, out of humility, places his own name after that of S. Thomas (S. Matt. x. 3), albeit he is put before S. Thomas in the lists of S. Mark (iii. 18) and S. Luke (v. 15). Consequently, these variations of the order forbid us to assume that any strict gradation of rank is implied, since otherwise the Evangelists would not have ventured to deviate from the series of the original appointment.

(ii.) As regards the three occasions on which S. Peter is specially chosen to accompany Christ, S. James and S. John share the distinction with him.

(iii.) The tribute money seems to couple him more individually with Christ; but an inquiry into the circumstances of the case deprives it of all importance for the matter at issue. For the event happened at Capernaum (S. Matt. xvii. 24), and a comparison of S. Mark i. 21, 29, shows that S. Peter's house was in that town: 'And they went into Capernaum; and straightway on the Sabbath day He entered into the synagogue, and taught. . . . And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew.' The tax-collectors at Capernaum, going from house to house to demand the temple-tribute, come to S. Peter's dwelling in its turn, and call on him, in his character of householder, to answer for his guest as well as for himself, in order that if He were a loyal Jew, and consequently morally liable to the tribute, it might be levied on Him also; and knowing that Christ was then abiding in the house, they ask Peter, 'Doth not your Master pay tribute?'—(S. Matt. xvii. 24). Accordingly, Christ accepts the position, and in His capacity as S. Peter's guest, enables him to acquit himself of his twofold responsibility in respect of the tax. But the relation is one which does not arise out of His spontaneous action for the purpose of honouring S. Peter, but from the accidental coincidence in time, so to speak, of the application to S. Peter for payment and our Lord's visit to his house. And, further, both Christ and S. Peter were, in this instance, alike subordinated to the Jewish law, which naturally treated them as on exactly the same footing below itself, and recognised no distinction of liability between them; so that no inference whatever can be drawn from the narrative as to their relation to each other under the Gospel, and it remains that the sole reason for the commemoration of the event is to record the miracle of the fish.

(iv.) Finally, S. John is coupled with S. Peter in the  
VOL. VI.—NO. XI.

C

errand to prepare the Passover, so that here too no special privilege is discernible.

This concludes the evidence obtainable from the four Gospels, and it is manifest so far that no jurisdiction over the Church was clearly bestowed on or unquestionably exercised by S. Peter. And yet the analogy of the Old Testament justifies us in looking for the exact reverse of both these propositions, if the hypothesis of the special charter be sound. For in the Old Testament there are no fewer than three Divine and exceptional charters of privilege bestowed, in all of which the terms of gift are precise and unambiguous, and in all of which, moreover, the right of transmission of the privilege by inheritance is expressly provided for and assured. These are (a) the covenant with Abraham and his seed, Gen. xii. 1-3, renewed in Gen. xvii. 6-8, and xxii. 16-18, confirmed to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 3, 4, 5, and to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 13, and xxxv. 11, 12; (b) the grant of the priesthood to Aaron and his descendants, Exod. xxviii. 1, confirmed by miracle, Numb. xvi. 31-40, xvii. 5, 8, and amplified in detail, Numb. xviii. 1-8; (c) the grant of the kingdom of Israel to David and his posterity, 1 Sam. vii. 1-16, renewed to Solomon, 1 Kings ix. 2, 6. It is contrary to the analogy of faith that the Law should be clear, definite, and literal in a certain respect, and that the Gospel, in a perfectly cognate and similar one, should be obscure, indeterminate, and typical, veiling the grant itself in mystical and enigmatic phrases, and passing over in entire silence the question of transmission. And, regarded from a legal point of view, as the plea of a Divine right conveyed by a formal grant makes necessary to the Ultramontane argument, there is no conclusion possible from this marked departure from these three leading precedents, or, so to speak, exemplifications of form, save that no similar powers were bestowed, or intended to be bestowed, and conveyed by the grant to S. Peter, seeing that the grantor in all four cases is the same person, so that we have a right to look for identical action.

But it may not unreasonably be argued in reply, that as it is S. Peter's peculiar office and dignity to be the Vicar of Christ, we cannot fairly expect to find him discharging that function while Christ is Himself present with His Church on earth, just as we do not look for moonlight when the sun is shining in its strength, albeit at night the moon far excels the stars singly or collectively. It is after the constitution of the Church on the Day of Pentecost, and thenceforward, that we must look for proofs of S. Peter's authority. And it is per-

factly true that he does at once assume a prominence in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, much exceeding anything recorded in the Gospels. The instances are as follows :—

1. He proposes, between the Ascension and Pentecost, the filling up of the vacancy left by Judas Iscariot in the college of Apostles.—(Acts i. 15, 21, 22.)

2. He preaches the first missionary sermon to the Jews on the Day of Pentecost.—(Acts ii. 14, 38.)

3. He works the first miracle of the Church, on the lame man at the Temple Gate—(Acts iii. 6), and two others of the very few recorded in the Acts (ix. 32–42).

4. He preaches the second missionary sermon to the Jews.—(Acts iii. 12.)

5. He is spokesman for himself and S. John before the Sanhedrim.—(Acts iv. 8.)

6. He passes judgment on Ananias and Sapphira.—(Acts v. 3–11.)

7. He is a second time spokesman for the Apostles before the Sanhedrim.—(Acts v. 29.)

8. He preaches the first missionary sermon to the Gentiles, and causes his converts from amongst them to be baptized.—(Acts x. 34, 48.)

9. He argues in the Council of Jerusalem for the relaxation of the ceremonial law in the case of Gentile Christians.—(Acts xv. 7.)

10. S. Paul, at the outset of his regular ministry, after his three years' sojourn in Arabia, goes up to Jerusalem to consult S. Peter.—(Gal. i. 18.)

Most of these acts are evidence of important and prominent station, and (2) and (8) of a distinction in honour greater in some respects than was accorded to any other Apostle, but not one of them singly, nor all of them collectively, can furnish a tittle of proof in favour of a primacy of jurisdiction. And it will be shown later that even the two acts which do confer peculiar lustre on S. Peter's name, are interpreted by ancient Christian writers in a sense adverse to the claim of supremacy.

(i.) The narrative of the election of S. Matthias, so far from helping to establish any claim to sovereign authority on S. Peter's behalf, furnishes one weighty item of evidence against it. Nothing is clearer than that if he had succeeded in any special sense to Christ's authority over the Church, as His Vicar, and if, in consequence, the Apostolic College bore any such relation to him, as, for instance, the College of Cardinals does to the Pope—and the Ultramontane theory

requires no less—S. Peter would have filled up the vacant place of Judas on his own authority, as the Pope deals with a vacant Cardinal's hat, or as Solomon, when clothed with David's twofold office of king and prophet, dealt with the high-priesthood, when he put Zadok the priest into the room of Abiathar (1 Kings ii. 26, 27, 35). But nothing of the sort meets us. S. Peter's share in the transaction is strictly confined to suggesting the necessity of designating a successor. The whole College unites in nominating two candidates, and the actual election is decided in quite another way than by the voice of its president, so that there is no likeness even to the mode commonly observed in episcopal elections now-a-days by the Roman Catholic Church in countries where it is disconnected from the State, namely, that the electors to a vacant see submit three names to the Pope, who may select one, or, at his pleasure, set them all aside, and appoint some fourth person, whom none of the electors had chosen or desired to see in the post, as was exemplified by the appointment of Dr. Manning to the titular see of Westminster in 1865, to the prejudice not merely of the freedom of election, but of the vested rights of Archbishop Errington as coadjutor of Cardinal Wiseman *cum jure successionis*. The narrative in the Acts runs thus :—

‘Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that He was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of His resurrection. And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed, and said, ‘Thou, Lord, Which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two Thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place. And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.’—Acts i. 21-26.

(ii.) Preaching a sermon to convert outsiders to the Church is in no respect akin to exercising jurisdiction over those within the Church.

(iii.) Nor is a miracle of healing, also performed on one outside the Church, an act of internal jurisdiction.

(iv.) This case is identical with (ii.).

(v.) A plea in self-defence before an alien and external tribunal is not an act of internal jurisdiction.

(vi.) The sentence on Ananias and Sapphira is unquestionably an example of coercive jurisdiction for the punishment, by Divine authority, of offences against religion. But (a) it is



an extraordinary and miraculous judgment in a wholly exceptional case, not an act of habitual and general jurisdiction; (*b*) it is inflicted not on an Apostle, nor on any office-bearer in the Church, but on two lay persons belonging to the particular local congregation over which S. Peter was then presiding, so that it affords no clue to the extent of his authority over other Apostles, or even over lay folk void of offence; (*c*) the authority exercised is in any case not visibly different in kind or degree from that of S. Paul, when he smote Elymas the sorcerer with blindness (Acts xiii. 6-12), or when he delivered Hymenæus and Alexander unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme (1 Tim. i. 20), while it is actually less than that which S. Paul exercised in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, because on that occasion the Apostle acted as a judge of appeal, not of first instance, deciding the case from a distance, and not on the spot.—(1 Cor. v. 3.)

(vii.) Is identical with v.

(viii.) Is identical with ii., with, however, a noteworthy hint of S. Peter's responsibility to the Apostolic College: 'Can any man forbid water,' &c. (Acts x. 47), words which imply that had no miracle attested his action, it might be disallowed at Jerusalem, in despite of his Apostolic office.

(ix.) This establishes no more than S. Peter's right to a voice in the assembly. He does not open the debate, for he does not begin to speak till 'after there had been much disputing' (Acts xv. 7), nor—what is more significant—does he close it, as will be shown presently.

(x.) S. Paul's consultation of S. Peter merely helps to establish what is not disputed, the prominence and weight which S. Peter's position gave him in the Church, that is to say, his primacy of honour. Whether it implied any obligation on S. Paul's part to be bound by S. Peter's decision, will be seen presently from an examination of another statement made by S. Paul in the very same Epistle, nay, in the very same part of its argument.

So far, then, the case of Ananias and Sapphira is the only example of anything resembling the exercise of actual jurisdiction and authority by S. Peter, and, as has been pointed out, it is a purely local instance, proving no more than the right of a pastor to rebuke and excommunicate one of his own immediate and local flock; a very slender result of the Petrine charter of privilege, if it be what is alleged.

On the other hand, there are three proofs in the Acts that establish more than mere failure of evidence as to S. Peter's exercise of supreme jurisdiction, because they show that it

was not his to exercise at all. First stands the narrative of the mission to Samaria :—

‘Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John : who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost : (For as yet He was fallen upon none of them : only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.’—Acts viii. 14–17.

It is a maxim admitting of no exception in human affairs that the sender is greater than the sent, and therefore the Apostolic Church at Jerusalem was in its totality greater than S. Peter, whatever his rank in relation to its separate members may have been. It would be simply impossible to produce a parallel from the modern Roman Church in which such a phrase as ‘The College of Cardinals at Rome, having heard that a dispute as to liturgical questions had arisen at Lyons, sent the Pope and Cardinal Simeoni to settle it,’ would be so much as conceivable.

Secondly, when S. Peter had baptized Cornelius and some other Gentiles, the remaining Apostles and brethren, instead of submissively accepting his decision, called him to account for the innovation ; and he in turn, instead of simply citing his privilege and bidding them obey, admitted his responsibility to them, by defending himself at length, recounting the circumstances of his vision :—

‘And the apostles and brethren that were in Judæa heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them,’ &c.—Acts xi. 1–5.

The third item of disproof is even weightier. It is that the presidency and deciding voice in the Council of Jerusalem belong to S. James, and not to S. Peter, who is no more than an influential debater, on a level with S. Paul and S. Barnabas. S. James terminates the discussion with an authoritative ruling, Acts xv. 19, ‘Wherefore my sentence is,’ or, as it would be more tersely and literally rendered, ‘Wherefore I *decide*,’ (Gr. ἐγὼ κρίνω ; Vulg. *ego judico*), whereas the words he uses of S. Peter’s argument are merely ‘Simeon hath declared,’ &c., where the exact rendering is no more than ‘stated’ or ‘related’ (Gr. ἐξηγήσατο ; Vulg. *narravit*). And the decree of the Council is strictly cor-

porate in its terms, implying absolute equality in the authority of its framers:—

‘Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church . . . . The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting . . . . It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send . . . . For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us . . . . Fare ye well.’—Acts xv. 22.

It will not avail here to argue that the presidency was conceded to S. James out of courtesy to his local rights as Bishop of the diocese of Jerusalem, even though his superior was present, much as in Church Congresses the diocesan is chairman, no matter what prelates of higher rank may attend; simply because this was not in any sense a local assembly for diocesan purposes, nor a merely consultative gathering, not intended to come to any decision, but a Council met to consider a question of first-rate importance to Christianity, and to formulate a binding decree respecting it for the whole Catholic Church of the time; while S. Peter’s presence and active share in the proceedings excludes any rebutting plea based on his relation to the Council.

The next step in the inquiry is to ascertain what claims S. Peter himself, by his acts or writings, makes to supreme personal authority, as ruler or teacher of the Church, as it is certain that he could not justifiably conceal nor even minimise a Divine charter of the sort, forming an integral part of the constitution of Christ’s Kingdom. Any acts or words of the kind would serve as an inspired comment on the terms of his commission, and should rightly be read into it as its measure and explanation.

There are exactly three passages of Holy Scripture which are relevant to this part of the discussion. They are these:—

1. ‘And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man.’—Acts x. 25, 26.

2. ‘The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed.’—1 S. Peter v. 1.

3. ‘Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth. Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance.—2 S. Peter i. 12–15.

It is to be observed that the phrase 'who am also an elder,' in the second of these citations, is simpler and humbler in the original and in the Vulgate, which have severally *συμπρεσβύτερος* and *consenior* = 'a fellow-elder;' so that here S. Peter does not press even his apostleship.

Obviously, these three citations, so far from strengthening the case for the supremacy, rather weaken it. To say the least, nothing can be extracted from them which denotes consciousness on S. Peter's part of his especial and singular privilege, while the language of the third quotation is that of a man who is seizing a final opportunity of warning his flock personally for the last time, in hopes that his dying words may have permanent influence; not that of a dying monarch and lawgiver, who had provided for all contingencies to the latest hour of time, by bequeathing infallible judgment and absolute power to a line of successors, heirs to his transmissible and inalienable privilege.

Moreover, if, as we are further assured, the plenitude of teaching as well as of ruling is vested in S. Peter and his successors, we are entitled to look for evidence of this fact also in Holy Scripture. S. Peter's own writings will in that case be our chief storehouse of doctrinal and disciplinary instruction. Here again, if no such writings had come down to us, we might perhaps assume that S. Mark's Gospel (itself the briefest and, in some sense, least important of the four) embodied for us the whole of Petrine teaching, but the existence of the two Epistles of S. Peter bars that plea. What do these Epistles yield us on examination?

They prove to be exclusively moral and hortatory, except in three passages, which only are, so to speak, classical texts supplying information on doctrinal matters not elsewhere set down in equivalent terms. They are these:—

1. 'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him.'—1 S. Peter iii. 18–22.

2. 'For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are

dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.'—1 S. Peter iv. 6.

3. 'And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation ; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you ; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things ; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.'—2 S. Peter iii. 15, 16.

And there is a fourth passage, noticeable as the only one worded in an authoritative fashion, but remarkable for its collective and as it were impersonal wording 'us the apostles,' contrasted with the first person singular of S. Paul and S. John :—

'This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you ; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance : that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour.'—2 S. Peter iii. 1, 2.

This, then, is the sum of the direct instruction in matter of doctrine, as distinguished from devotional and moral exhortation, peculiar to these Epistles, which S. Peter has given to the Church—two sentences giving some information as to the souls of those who died before the coming of Christ, one declaration of the nature and effect of Baptism, and one warning against misinterpreting S. Paul's writings. There is no disciplinary instruction whatever. On the other hand, if we turn to the Epistles of S. James and S. John, even without taking account of the latter Apostle's Gospel and Apocalypse, we shall find a larger element of both discipline and doctrine than in S. Peter's writings. Thus, for example, in the second chapter of S. James's Epistle, a rule is laid down about the equality of rich and poor in Christian assemblies :—

'My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment ; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place ; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool : are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts ?—S. James ii. 1-4.

In another place a rule is laid down about the anointing the sick and the duty of confession :—

'Is any among you afflicted ? let him pray. Is any merry ? let

him sing psalms. Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.'—S. James v. 13-16.

And, perhaps more significantly than these passages, the error of those who perverted S. Paul's teaching is combated directly, and not by way of broad general statement, whereby we learn that their error was Antinomianism, and it is not too much to say that, as an element of Christian teaching, S. James's doctrine of the necessity of works as a proof and fruit of faith, laid down in chapter ii. 14-26, in correction of the misuse which had been made in the Early Church, as it has been in modern times also, of S. Paul's language in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, is of incomparably greater practical importance, and has occupied a much larger space in Catholic theology, than the above-cited words of S. Peter.

So, too, if we examine the Epistles of S. John, we shall find more explicit dogmatic teaching and clearer references to ecclesiastical discipline than in S. Peter's writings. There is, chiefly in the First Epistle, the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Homoeousion clearly laid down (1 S. John i. 1, 2; ii. 22, 23; iv. 3, 15; v. 6, 10, 12); while in the Second and Third we have these intimations of discipline:—

'Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.'—2 S. John, 9-11;

and

'I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church.'—3 S. John, 9, 10.

That is to say, in effect, if the two Epistles of S. Peter had been lost, as the Epistle to the Church of Laodicea has been lost (Coloss. iv. 16), albeit much food for devout meditation would be gone, no practical difference in the sum and colour of Christian teaching would be discernible, except as



to the one speculation concerning the spirits of the pre-Christian patriarchs—a conclusion wholly inconsistent with the position of universal Teacher claimed for S. Peter by Roman controversialists, and yet indisputable as matter of fact. For Christianity, as we know it, is Pauline and Johannine all but exclusively, and if there be a Petrine element, it is so obscure as to be matter of conjecture, not of knowledge.<sup>1</sup>

There remains still a great mass of yet uncited Scripture testimony, which is perhaps weightier than all that has thus far been adduced, namely, that which consists of the life and writings of S. Paul.

That superior prominence in the narrative of the Apostolic Church, already named as evident of S. Peter from the moment of the Ascension, is not prolonged throughout. His leadership and chief share in guiding the fortunes and in moulding the shape of the infant community, end, so far as Scripture records for us, with his admission of the Gentiles into Church fellowship. From the time of S. Paul's return to Jerusalem, after the three years of retirement in Arabia which followed his conversion (Gal. i. 17), he completely overshadows S. Peter in the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles, to such an extent, indeed, that no mention whatever of the elder Apostle occurs after the account of his deliverance from prison (Acts xii. 3-17), except his speech at the Council of Jerusalem in Acts xv. 7-11, already referred to; whereas the whole latter portion of the Acts, including chapters xiii.-xxviii., with the exception of part of chapter xv., is entirely devoted to recording the actions and missionary travels of S. Paul—an amount of direct biographical record not paralleled by any human lives in Holy Writ save those of Moses and David. And if it be urged that this circumstance is due to the 'accident,' so to speak, of S. Luke, the compiler of the Acts, having been the chosen companion of S. Paul (Coloss. iv. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 11), the reply is obvious, that S. Peter, too, had an Evangelist in his train, 'Marcus, my son' (S. Peter v. 13), so that they

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, if to be found now at all, it is in the literature of the Syrian Churches, influenced by the once famous schools of Edessa and Nisibis, whose Petrine tone is probable evidence that the 'Babylon' of S. Peter's First Epistle is the ancient city of Mesopotamia, in their neighbourhood, and not Rome; in which case the one possible link of *Scriptural* evidence to connect him with that See fails. And whether or not, as these Syrian Churches severed themselves from Catholic unity in hostility to the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and have remained separated ever since, they are proof that adherence to Petrine teaching does not necessarily connote orthodoxy or Catholicity in all respects.

were on an equal footing in that respect ; and, had the events of S. Peter's life been as important for us to know as those of S. Paul, it would doubtless have pleased the Holy Ghost to have inspired S. Mark to write them for our edification. Yet, on the Ultramontane hypothesis, every act and word of S. Peter must needs be of vital interest, and especially everything which took the shape of a dogmatic instruction or a disciplinary regulation, as moulding the Church for all time.

The second fact which meets us under this head is the great bulk of S. Paul's writings, here again only paralleled by Moses, even if we exclude the Epistle to the Hebrews as not S. Paul's, albeit Pauline in its doctrine. Apart from the Pentateuch, Isaiah, with its 66 chapters of 1,302 verses, is the largest product of a single author in the Old Testament ; for the Psalter, with its 150 Psalms of 2,500 verses, is the work of several hands besides that of David ; while S. Paul's Epistles occupy 87 chapters, with 2,023 verses, and if the Hebrews be added in, 100 chapters with 2,325 verses, as compared with the eight chapters of 166 verses of S. Peter's two Epistles. Further, S. Luke's or the Pauline Gospel, exceeds S. Mark's, or the Petrine, in the ratio of 24 chapters with 1,151 verses to 16 chapters with 678 verses ; and there are the 28 chapters of 1,007 verses of the Acts, also Pauline in source, to be added in besides, making a grand total of 152 chapters with 4,483 verses as against 24 chapters with 844 verses.

In the third place, not only are the directly Pauline writings fourteen times in excess of the Petrine in mere bulk, but they are of enormously greater literary and theological importance, being not merely replete with doctrinal statements and disciplinary enactments, such as are noticeably absent from S. Peter's Epistles, but having in truth been incomparably the most powerful factor in moulding the life and tenets of the Christian Church, which has drawn, for example, the whole of its teaching on grace, election, and free-will, on the moral and dogmatic results of Christ's Resurrection, on the nature of Baptism, on the unity of the Church, on the operations of the Holy Spirit, on the place of tradition as an element of doctrine, on the relation of the Law to the Gospel, and on the fundamental principles of ecclesiastical discipline, from the Epistles of S. Paul ; for his Pastoral Epistles are our chief repertory of knowledge as to the rules of Church government which prevailed in the earliest times. So thoroughly did the Fathers realise this pre-eminence of S. Paul as the teacher of the Church, that wherever we find 'the

Apostle' referred to by them, with no specification of person, they always mean S. Paul. So Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 36; so Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.* ii. 7; so S. Augustine, *Cont. Epist. Pelag.*, saying, 'So, when "Apostle" is said, if it be not expressed what Apostle, none is understood save Paul;' so S. Chrysostom, *Hom. iv. in Act. Apost.*, observing, 'When you say *Apostle*, at once all think of him [Paul], just as when you say *Baptist* they think of John.' And this custom prevails in the Oriental Churches to the present day, where 'the Apostle' means the Book of S. Paul's Epistles. Similarly, S. Luke's Gospel is far more important than S. Mark's, which, save for a few passages, might be described as a short recension of S. Matthew, and could, so to speak, be more easily dispensed with than any of the others.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile this broad fact with the position now claimed for the Popes as chief teachers of the Church in virtue of their heirship to S. Peter, for it is simply indisputable that S. Peter either did not fill this office at all in the primitive Church, or that by divine intervention he was set aside in it, and the records of his occupancy destroyed, leaving the apparent dignity, as well as the actual influence, in the hands of S. Paul, so far, at any rate, as the Biblical notices guide us; thus carrying out under the New Testament that rule of the first being last and the elder serving the younger, laid down by Christ, and evidenced in the Old Testament in the cases of Cain and Seth, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Reuben and Joseph or Judah, Aaron and Moses, Eliab and David, Adonijah and Solomon.

Such is the general result of this remarkable contrast in the parts severally played by the two Apostles in the New Testament, but there is in addition some important evidence obtainable from S. Paul's writings; first, as to the true measure and limits of S. Peter's official authority; and secondly, as regards the extent of S. Paul's own powers.

The first class of these testimonies is comprised in the following paragraphs:—

i. 'Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?'—1 Cor. i. 10-13.

ii. 'Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's.'—1 Cor. iii. 21-23.

iii. 'When they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (for He that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:) and when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do. But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?'—Gal. ii. 7-14.

iv. 'And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.'—1 Cor. xii. 28.

v. 'And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.'—Eph. iv. 11, 12.

From these five passages we collect the subjoined facts, as divinely revealed:—

*a.* It was a mark of schism to adhere specifically to S. Peter so as to form a separate school or party in the Church, instead of this very choice being treated, as it is by Ultramontanes now, as the one peculiar note and test of Catholic fellowship and of covenant with God.

*b.* The Christian body is not S. Peter's domain, but he himself, contrariwise, as part of that body, belongs to the whole, and is included in its possessions, as it in turn is included in Christ's.

*c.* Instead of the Church universal being, so to speak, S. Peter's diocese, he was divinely restricted to the Circumcision, that is to say, the Church of Jewish converts, and had no jurisdiction whatever over the Gentiles, and, consequently, as no subsequent enlargement of this restriction is recorded

either by Scripture or by other sources of revelation, he could not transmit to any of his successors a wider authority than that here named as his limit. The restriction is nowhere explained to us, and looks at first sight somewhat inconsistent with S. Peter's priority in making Gentile converts; but it is probably analogous to the subdivision of a too extensive diocese in our own day, whereby the original bishop gradually finds one district after another withdrawn from his jurisdiction, not in the least by way of slight or penalty, but as a matter of necessity. Whatever be the cause, nevertheless such withdrawal deprives him of episcopal rights over the severed districts, unless saved to him in the capacity of Metropolitan by express provision, nor can he transmit his original rights over the whole unbroken diocese to his successors. There are two modern and familiar instances, Australia and Cape Town, in the history of the Anglican Church in the colonies. The inference, so far, is that S. Peter had no Gentile jurisdiction to transmit, for the separate 'Church of the Circumcision' did not merge in the general Christian body till the reign of Hadrian, fifty years after S. Peter's death.

*d.* The order of the three Apostolic names, 'James, Cephas, John,' cited by S. Paul, seems to imply either equality of rank amongst them, or else that S. James, as head of the principal Church of the Circumcision at Jerusalem, was now in some sense S. Peter's ecclesiastical superior. And this view is supported by the words which tell us (Gal. ii. 12) that S. Peter's line of policy at Antioch was through fear of S. James's legates, a fear not easily explicable on any ground save that of some accountability on his part to them. There is one further item of evidence, too slight for independent importance, but cumulative, which makes in the same direction, namely, that when S. Peter was released from prison he directed the people at S. Mark's house to 'Go, shew these things unto James and to the brethren' (Acts xii.)—words which may imply that he was in some way bound to report himself to what, in modern language, would be called the Bishop and Chapter of the see.

*e.* Next, there is at once the full disproof of S. Peter's infallibility and of his supremacy. He decides wrongly on an important question of faith and morals—for even if we accept the view of S. Jerome and others, that the debate was pre-arranged between S. Paul and himself, he was assigned the worse cause—as is established by the Church having ever since taken S. Paul's view of the situation, and he is withstood face to face, not submitted to, by the younger Apostle, who,

had he been in the wrong, would have had his rebellion—for it would have been no less—as clearly censured in Holy Writ as S. Peter's denial of Christ, to warn all others by so terrible a fall, instead of standing as it does now, by the will of the Holy Ghost, as a proof of S. Paul's zeal and loyalty for the truth of the Gospel, and a ground of justifiable satisfaction to himself.

*f.* Lastly, the sketch which S. Paul gives of the divinely ordered constitution of the Church becomes more than merely defective if there were any office and authority higher than that of an Apostle instituted by Christ, and forming the immediate link of connexion—the neck, so to speak, between the Head and the Body.

It is clear, then, that in his capacity of Doctor of the Gentiles, and chief theologian of the primitive Christian Church, S. Paul, who expressly states himself to 'have kept back nothing that was profitable,' and to 'have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God' (Acts xx. 20, 27), not merely avoids any allusion in his copious writings to the 'privilege of Peter,' but uses language so manifestly inconsistent therewith as to necessarily mislead all to whom those writings might come, supposing that privilege to be a matter of Divine truth; while the silence of S. James also, as indeed of all the other New Testament writers, may be taken as proof that this was not one of S. Paul's misconstrued teachings which had been perverted, and needing correction at some other hand, but the received doctrine of Apostolic days.

There is besides this direct Pauline gloss on the alleged privilege of Peter, an indirect one, even fuller in its statements, and scarcely less convincing in its form. It is quite possible to argue that we have no right to draw conclusions from S. Peter's marked reticence as to his own supremacy, because we are not in a position to judge what kind of acts and language he would have used to enforce it, and we are not justified in treating our mere guess-work as to what would or would not have been fit and proper for him to say and do, as if it were a solid piece of evidence. In truth, this mode of reasoning (technically called the *d priori* argument) is itself the mainstay of every Roman controversialist who pleads the *practical necessity* of a visible and infallible Head of the Church, as a proof that such a head does really exist, so that the objection is not valid from that quarter, but it may be allowed to pass, since it can readily be dispensed with, inasmuch as S. Paul supplies us with all the illustration required.

The peculiar and altogether exceptional mode of S. Paul's



appointment to the Apostolic office, and the leading part he took against the Judaizing school in the infant Church, caused his rank to be frequently called in question, and his authority disputed. Hence, he was obliged to magnify his office, and to insist on his powers and privileges, and that frequently; albeit there could be no such imperative obligation for him to do so, as for S. Peter to do the like, if it were true, as we are now told, that the whole relation of every human soul to the Father and Christ depends on, and is inextricably bound up with, its relation to the See of Peter. The rejection of S. Paul might be, and in fact was, perfectly consistent with acceptance of Christianity and with membership of the Church, for it did not involve the extrusion of the Judaizers who refused to acknowledge him, but the rejection of S. Peter, on the Ultramontane theory, would have been apostasy from the Faith itself. S. Peter would, therefore, have been bound, if not on his own behalf, yet on that of his successors, to allege his peculiar charter as plainly as S. Paul does his Apostolic character.

Let us now collect and examine the most salient instances of this vindication of his rights by S. Paul:—

a. 'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, (which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,) concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead: by Whom we have received grace and apostleship, for obedience to the faith among all nations, for His name: among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ: to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.'—Rom. i. 1-7.

b. 'For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office.'—Rom. xi. 13.

c. 'Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost. I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation.'—Rom. xv. 15-20.

d. 'I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons

VOL. VI.—NO. XI.

D

I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel. Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me. For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church. Now some are puffed up, as though I would not come to you. But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power. For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power. What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?'—1 Cor. iv. 14-21.

e. 'For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'—1 Cor. v. 3-5.

f. 'But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches. (Gr. καὶ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πᾶσις διατάσσωμαι. Vulg. *et sicut in omnibus ecclesiis doceo*).—1 Cor. vii. 17.

g. 'Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ. Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.'—1 Cor. xi. 1, 2.

h. 'Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem. And if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me.'—1 Cor. xvi. 1-4.

i. 'For to this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye be obedient in all things. To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ.'—2 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

j. 'For I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles.'—2 Cor. xi. 5.

k. Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.' (Gr. ἡ μέριμνα πᾶσιν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν: Vulg. *solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*).—2 Cor. xi. 28.

l. 'I am become a fool in glorying: ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.'—2 Cor. xii. 11-13.

*m.* 'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that, if I come again, I will not spare: since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, which to you-ward is not weak, but is mighty in you. . . . Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction.'—2 Cor. xiii. 1-3, 10.

*n.* 'Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with you.'—Philipp. iv. 9.

*o.* 'Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. . . . And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.'—2 Thess. iii. 6, 14.

*p.* 'Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.'—2 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

*q.* 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.'—Tit. i. 5.

Besides all these statements of S. Paul's apostolic authority, we find disciplinary enactments, which need not be cited in detail, laid down by him on the following points:—

1. Observance of Jewish distinctions of food and of days, Rom. xiv.; Coloss. ii. 16.

2. Lawsuits between Christians, 1 Cor. vi. 1-4.

3. Marriage-tie between Christians and heathens, 1 Cor. vii. 12-17.

4. Lawfulness of using pagan sacrifices as food, 1 Cor. viii.; x. 27-28.

5. Head-dress of men and women at public prayer, 1 Cor. xi. 4-16.

6. Preparation for Communion, 1 Cor. xi. 28.

7. Vernacular language in public worship, 1 Cor. xiv. 15-19.

8. Order in public worship, 1 Cor. xiv. 27-33, 40.

9. Women forbidden to preach, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35.

10. Weekly offertory, 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

11. Intercessory prayer, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

12. Dress and conduct of women, 1 Tim. ii. 9-15.

13. Qualifications of bishops and deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 1-13; Tit. i. 7-9.

14. Qualification of Church widows, 1 Tim. v. 9-13.

15. Excommunication of heretics after two admonitions, Tit. iii. 10.

These disciplinary rulings need not be further considered, but it is important to cite them as showing what kind of matters we might fairly expect to have found in S. Peter's Epistles had he been supreme ruler as well as chief teacher in the Church of Apostolic times. But it is desirable to emphasise certain results of the fuller citations just given, excluding such of those texts as we may fairly hold to denote no more than the degree of rank and power common to the Apostolic body, albeit even these are not paralleled by anything in S. Peter's Epistles.

*a.* S. Paul alleges himself to be 'not a whit [*al.* in nothing] behind the very chiefest Apostles,' making no exception in favour of S. Peter or S. James.

*b.* He claims the whole field of the 'Church of the Uncircumcision' as his own, to the direct and specified *exclusion* of S. Peter, alleging himself further to be '*the*,' not an, 'Apostle of the Gentiles.'

*c.* In virtue of this claim, he demands the obedience of the *Roman Church*, giving no hint throughout the Epistle to it of any superior, previous, or co-existing claim on S. Peter's part.

*d.* He tells the Church of Corinth that the only particular in which it was inferior to any other Church was that he did not permit it to defray his expenses. He gives no hint that Antioch or Rome, as S. Peter's see, had any priority or authority over Corinth.

*e.* He declares that the 'care of *all* the Churches' is his daily task.

*f.* He ordains rules to be observed 'in *all* Churches.'

*g.* He sends his legates with plenary powers to act for him, alleges his commission to them as their full warrant, and, unlike S. Peter (2 Pet. i. 13-15), provides at least one personal successor to himself, to transmit his teaching authoritatively.

*h.* He directs the excommunication of all persons who refuse to accept his injunctions as being in effect those of Christ Himself.

Now, if it were S. Paul who is alleged to have been the infallible and sovereign head of the Church Militant on earth, it would be extremely easy to support such an allegation by the cited passages, all of which are at least consistent with such a theory, and some of which even seem to force it on our attention. Nevertheless, no such allegation has ever been

made on S. Paul's behalf. We can guess what use would have been made of it on S. Peter's behalf had such evidence been producible from the Petrine Epistles.

Further, not only are we justified in saying that the claim made for S. Peter absolutely requires the production of some at least equivalent, if not more cogent, Scriptural testimony, confessedly non-existent, but that the Pauline assertions *a, b, c, d, e,* and *f,* are wholly inconsistent with and destructive of the alleged 'Privilege of Peter,' as stated by the modern Church of Rome, unless some overwhelmingly rebutting evidence, unequivocally bearing the stamp of Divine revelation, can be adduced in its favour from some other quarter than Holy Scripture—a question to be considered later.

The charter of privilege, so far, is shown to be restricted to the words in S. Matthew xvi. 18, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church.' This sentence obviously does not satisfy the second condition—that of clearness—laid down by the Canonists, as necessary to fulfil the legal requirements of a claim of privilege, because there is confessedly an ambiguity in its wording, which is not certain, manifest, and unmistakable in meaning.

The ambiguity consists in a play upon words, so to speak, visible in the Greek text, which runs thus: *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*: a peculiarity reproduced by the Vulgate, which translates thus: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam.*

With this compare the partially parallel passage in S. John i. 42, 'And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone.' Here the Greek runs: *Σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς, ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος*; and the Vulgate: *Tu vocaberis Cephias; quod interpretatur Petrus.*

Obviously, to warrant the stress laid on this obscure saying of our Lord's, the same word ought to be used in both clauses of the sentence, and it should run in the Greek: *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρῳ, κ.τ.λ.*, or else *Σὺ εἶ πέτρα* in the first clause; and in the Vulgate: *Tu es Petrus, et super hunc Petrum, &c.*, or else we ought to have *Tu es Petra* in the earlier member. As the clauses actually stand, there is contrast as well as likeness implied, and the *stone*, although akin to the *rock*, is something different and apart from it, less in dimensions, stability, and importance, for though *πέτρος* is used with extreme rarity in Attic Greek to signify a rock, it is never so found in the LXX. or the New Testament.

An ingenious reply was devised by Cardinal Bellarmine

to this objection, which has been frequently reproduced since his time. It is that our Lord, speaking in Syriac or Aramaic, actually did use the same word in both clauses, saying, 'Thou art *Cepha*, and upon this *Cepha* I will build My Church.' The answer to this is fivefold. (1) It is matter of reasonable conjecture and high probability only, not of absolute certainty, that our Lord did use, or must have used, the same word, and indeed that He spoke in Syriac or Aramaic at all, and not in Greek. (2) In any case, if His original words are *not* those of the Greek S. Matthew, they are for ever lost to us, and as the very first and fundamental rule of Canon law as to any privilege is that the document containing it must be produced, this plea is barred. (3) For us, S. Matthew's Greek is the original text, and not a mere translation, so that even *if* we were sure of the unproved assertion made by Bellarmine, we should yet be compelled to accept S. Matthew's variation of the two words, as divinely inspired for the express purpose of marking a difference which the Syriac failed to accentuate or suggest. (4) In any case, no Roman Catholic is at liberty to raise the plea at all, because he is certainly bound by the decrees of Trent, and perhaps by those of the Vatican, to accept the 'old Latin Vulgate edition as holy and canonical' (*Conc. Vatic. Constit. de Fide*, cap. ii.), and inasmuch as this version marks the antithesis between *Petrus* and *petram*, Roman Catholics are barred from asserting their identity. (5) Lastly, as regards those not so restricted, and who are at liberty to look at the question as a purely textual and grammatical one, the reply is direct and conclusive, that both the Hebrew *Cepha* (כֶּפֶה) and the Peshittâ Syriac (ܕܚܝܬܐ), when they mean rock or stone, are of the feminine gender, which Cephas, or Peter, as a masculine noun denoting a man's name, certainly is not, either in Syriac or Greek; and in the ancient Syriac version of this very passage, S. Matt. xvi. 18 (doubtless the most trustworthy gloss obtainable), the feminine pronoun is found united with the second *Cepha* thus, ܕܚܝܬܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ (*hādhe Kīpha = hanc petram*), not ܕܚܝܬܐ (*hana = hunc*), which Bellarmine's argument would require.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This Peshittâ version (which in this place agrees precisely with the Curetonian Gospels), assuming that Christ spoke Syro-Aramaic, is probably the nearest reproduction extant of His exact words, and is at any rate good authority for the interpretation of S. Matt. xvi. 18, in the second century. And it is very noteworthy that in two other extremely old Syriac versions, the Palestinian Lectionary, published by Count Miniscalchi Erizzo from a Vatican MS., and the 'Philoxenian' version by Thomas of Heraclea (A.D. 533), the Greek word *Petros* occurs in the first clause in



If the question be now regarded from another Biblical standpoint, the result is not more favourable to the Ultramontane claim. The theological principle known as the analogy of faith, already referred to, demands that the Gospel shall always be at the very least on an equality with the Law, and that, wherever possible, it shall move in a higher plane, but that it shall never descend under any circumstances whatever to a lower level, far less substitute a type for a reality, a shadow for a substance.

Now, wherever in the Old Testament the word *rock* is spiritually used to denote either the basis and strength of the Hebrew Church, or the refuge and confidence of a single believer, it invariably means none save Almighty God Himself, in which sense it occurs no fewer than 35 times.

Here are a few select examples:—

1. 'He is the rock, His work is perfect : for all His ways are judgment : a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He.'—Deut. xxii. 4.
2. 'Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee.'—Deut. xxxii. 18.
3. 'There is none holy as the Lord : for there is none beside Thee : neither is there any rock like our God.'—1 Sam. ii. 2.
4. 'The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer ; the God of my rock. For who is God, save the Lord ? and who is a rock, save our God ?'—2 Sam. xxii. 2, 3, 32.
5. 'The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.'—2 Sam. xxiii. 3.
6. 'Truly my soul waiteth upon God : from Him cometh my salvation. He only is my rock and my salvation ; He is my defence ; I shall not be greatly moved.'—Psalm lxii. 1, 2.
7. 'Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for in the Lord Jehovah is the Rock of ages.'—Isa. xxvi. 4. (marg.)
8. 'Is there a God beside Me ? yea, no Rock, I know not any.'—Isa. xlv. 8. (marg.)

The remaining examples are Deut. xxxii. 15, 30, 31 ; 2 Sam. xxii. 47 ; Psalm xviii. 2, 31, 46 ; xix. 14 (marg.) ; xvii. 5 ; xxviii. 1 ; xxxi. 2, 3 ; xlii. 9 ; lxi. 2 ; lxii. 2, 7 ; lxxi. 3. (marg.) ; lxxiii. 26 (marg.) ; lxxviii. 35 ; lxxxix. 26 ; xcii. 15 ; xciv. 22 (marg.) ; xcv. 1 ; Isa. viii. 14 ; xxx. 29 (marg.) ; li. 1 ; Hab. i. 12. (marg.)

Even if this remarkable identity of spiritual application

Syriac letters ; while the native word *K'îphâ* is in the second clause of the Palestinian version, and its synonym *shûd* in the second clause of the Philoxenian, thus studiously avoiding even the chance of identification of the Rock with Peter.

were not preserved, we have three authoritative glosses in the New Testament itself—one by our Lord, given with slight verbal differences by S. Matthew vii. 24, 25, and S. Luke vi. 47, 48 :—

‘Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock ; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house ; and it fell not : for it was founded upon a rock.’

‘Whosoever cometh to Me, and heareth My sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like : He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock : and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it : for it was founded upon a rock.’

S. Paul supplies the others, 1 Cor. x. 4, and 1 Cor. iii. 2 :—

‘They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them : and that Rock was Christ.’

‘For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.’

If it had so happened that these New Testament illustrations of the meaning of S. Matthew xvi. 18 were absent, and that in their stead others were found which seemed to warrant, or even to enforce, the Ultramontane interpretation, then in that case there would be here the only exception, and that a wholly unaccountable one, to the rule which insists that the Gospel plane must be higher than the Mosaic, wherever a higher plane is conceivable and possible. For extol as we may the privilege of Peter, clothe him with one semi-divine attribute after another, magnify as we choose his share in the establishment of Christianity, and his authority over the Apostolic Church ; nevertheless, the interval between him and God cannot be appreciably abridged, the finite cannot be stretched so as even to suggest the infinite. And if the Infinite and Almighty was the Rock of Israel, while Peter is the rock of Christendom, then the Gospel has sunk unspeakably and immeasurably below the Law. Even in human affairs, every one acknowledges the wide difference—perfectly measurable though it be—there is between the personal visit of a king, coming in a recognised and public fashion to his subjects, and that of a mere viceroy, though loaded with titles, decorated with orders, and clothed with plenipotentiary powers ; and no one could be persuaded that equal favour had been shown to two cities, one of which had welcomed the sovereign as a personal guest, while the other had perforce to put up with a

deputy. So ends our inquiry into that part of the evidence for the personal privilege of Peter which is professedly based on Holy Scripture, regarded in the light of a purely legal document of absolutely indefeasible authority, and as the main evidence adduced in support of the claim. It is obvious that unless some corroborative testimony of equally high and indisputable character can be discovered the case is not made out, and does not even satisfy several of the tests of validity exacted by the Roman Canon law itself in all claims of privilege.

---

#### ART. II.—ETERNAL PUNISHMENT AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

1. *The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things.* A Letter to a Friend. By ANDREW JUKES. (Longmans.)
2. *Salvator Mundi; or, Is Christ the Saviour of all Men?* By SAMUEL COX. (C. Kegan Paul and Co.)
3. *Catholic Eschatology and Universalism.* An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution. By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. (Basil Montagu Pickering.)

ONE of the greatest and most pressing difficulties of the present day has reference to Eschatology. On every side men are asking the question—What are we to believe regarding the final estate of mankind, and more especially in regard to the wicked? A very definite doctrine of eternal punishment has come down to us among the traditions of post-Reformation Theology; but it is just that doctrine that it is felt impossible to receive. How are we to reconcile the eternal burning of hell with the goodness of God? The punishment, it is felt, is out of all proportion to the offence. And then other questionings arise, Why did God create men when He must have foreseen the end? Of one man, it was said, and probably it is true of others, 'good were it for that man if he had not been born.' Then why were they born? Then, it is also asked, had they a fair chance? If so, what mean those dogmas of a fallen nature, which is *utterly* corrupt and powerless, which must certainly go wrong if left to itself? What means the dogma of irresistible grace, which teaches that God and God only can save; that men must be snatched as brands from the burning, if they are to be saved at all?

If God, and God only, can save, then why does He not save all? Is it so certain that He will not save all? What is there in Scripture or in reason and conscience which militates against this supposition? At any rate, we feel that eternal burning is not reconcilable with the goodness of God. Either we must cease to believe in the goodness of God, or we must cease to believe in eternal burning.

So men reason. They gather arguments from reason and conscience against the doctrine of eternal punishment; and, then, under the influence of strong prepossession, they set themselves to criticise the teaching of Holy Scripture. That teaching is plain enough to the simple mind; but by subjecting it to torture and criticism they contrive to make it say something quite different. It never seems to have occurred to them to ask, whether the real difficulty may lie, not in the teaching of Holy Scripture, but in a false and narrow system of Christian doctrine, which they have inherited. That system is perfectly well known to Church theologians under the name of Calvinism. Ever since the Reformation High Church theologians have been predicting of it just such consequences as those which are now ensuing. They have pointed out that its positions and premisses are so narrow, as to be quite onesided. They have especially urged that they must issue in positions which are quite incompatible with the goodness of God. It may be good for the pious Christian subjectively to feel that he is *utterly* corrupt in nature, that he can *do nothing* towards his salvation, that God must *do all*; but to change these pious feelings, as Calvinism does, into objective theological dogmas, can only end in disaster. We see the consequences of doing so in the difficulty about eternal punishment which perplexes us at the present moment; and it is, in fact, only one of the difficulties in which the Calvinistic system issues on every side.

From this it is perfectly clear that the true remedy for the present perplexity is theological reform. The question of eternal punishment can never be satisfactorily solved, if it is treated in an isolated way; more especially if it is treated by itself, *with the tacit assumption of the Calvinistic premisses*. The true remedy is to be found in the correction of these premisses; in the widening of our theological conceptions generally. It will be seen that the moment this is done, the presumptions and arguments on which the denial of eternal punishment is based, disappear, and the doctrine, which is undoubtedly the doctrine of Holy Scripture, emerges in harmony with the conscience of mankind and the goodness

of God. Unhappily this is not the way in which the subject has been approached. It has been dealt with exclusively in an isolated way, and the consequences, as we think, have been very deplorable. A doctrine has been advocated, which is at variance, as we think, with all the facts of human nature, with God's general government of the world, and with the plain teaching of Holy Scripture. The doctrine, too, is far from being a purely speculative one. On the contrary, it is intensely practical. Surely if the doctrine of eternal and utter failure be true, and if the essential elements of such failure are worked out in a man's life in this world, the responsibility of those who would persuade men to the contrary must be very great.

Foremost among the advocates of this new doctrine we must name Andrew Jukes; nor can we name him without a feeling of the deepest respect. None can read his writings without a feeling of great admiration for their many excellencies. In them we encounter a profoundly reverent and devout mind, penetrated throughout with all the poetry of mysticism. In fact, it is chiefly owing to the charm of his writings that the doctrine he so winningly advocates has gained such wide acceptance. He gains the confidence of his reader, and hurries him on to accept his conclusion along a smooth and easy path. And yet Mr. Jukes is pre-eminently an unsafe guide. When we have read through his book and begin to reflect, we are amazed to think of the doubts and difficulties that now start up with such persistent sternness. We never encountered them along the flowery path by which he led us, and yet there they are, demanding consideration and utterly refusing to be charmed away. The truth is, that Mr. Jukes' mind is essentially untheological, and consequently unfit for grappling with such a difficulty as the present. There is a singular want of comprehensiveness about it, and an equally singular inability to see the force of facts and considerations lying outside its immediate horizon.

In many respects Mr. Cox is the very opposite of Mr. Jukes. If Mr. Jukes gains the confidence of his reader and hurries him along in spite of himself, Mr. Cox manages to destroy confidence from the very outset by his too great eagerness to plead his cause. For instance, he begins by taking a saying of our Blessed Lord, which was clearly uttered *ad hominem* in the sense of an absolute dogmatic statement; and upon this wrong rendering bases the most momentous of the conclusions he arrives at. The sequel of the book is entirely in accordance with this unhappy beginning. What

could be more futile, for instance, than to take the words *damnation* and *hell* for separate consideration, to trace them up to their original meaning, and then to attempt to pin down the Christian to the acceptance of the meaning and import which attached to them in Jewish or heathen systems? We would just ask Mr. Cox to perform a similar process upon the words *Θεός*, *Deus*, or *God*, and to reflect upon the consequences. He seems entirely to forget that Christianity is a new revelation, and consequently that its technical terms, bearing on momentous subjects, received a new meaning and a quite different application. That meaning is not to be ascertained by any tracing of words up to their origin, but by careful induction of all the facts in the new revelation which bear upon the point. In regard to the words under consideration, Christ presents to us, as the last and closing scene, the outcome of all that is now going on—the awful picture of the Judge upon his throne: all nations are gathered before Him, and He pronounces, as we believe, an irrevocable sentence, the consequence of which is, that the wicked are sent away into everlasting fire, or everlasting chastisement. Now, whatever the words which express *damnation* and *hell* may have meant in other systems, this grand fact fixes their meaning for Christianity; nor can they be dismissed from the new revelation in the easy way in which Mr. Cox professes to dismiss them. We think the effect of such one-sided reasoning can only be disastrous. Mr. Cox must singularly deceive himself, if he imagines his readers cannot see through it; and what, we ask, will be the effect upon their Christian faith, supposing that their feelings are engaged on his own side? We regret it all the more on Mr. Cox's own account; for his book is the work of an able man, and with many of its thoughts and aspirations we have great sympathy.

On the other side, we can speak very highly of Mr. Oxenham's work. Mr. Oxenham is an able and accomplished writer and a controversialist of the first order. Though written from the Roman Catholic point of view, his book will be none the less useful to Churchmen who desire to master the subject, and it is especially valuable in view of modern thought and literature. Mr. Oxenham deals with the subject on the threefold basis of reason, tradition, and scripture; and on each of these heads the reader will find much matter and very comprehensive and sound reasoning.

In addressing ourselves to the consideration of the momentous subject of eternal punishment, the first thing that



claims our attention seems to be the question, What does Christianity really teach about hell, or the state of the lost? Unfortunately we miss in all the works which we have met with a really comprehensive inquiry into this point. In fact, all the writers whom we have studied pass it by. They assume, without the slightest inquiry, popular and untheological notions, and then they argue that because a hell, such as the popular fancy has painted it, is to them incredible, therefore there is no hell at all. It is clear that this is altogether a wrong procedure. Before we reject the doctrine of eternal punishment we ought to make sure that what we reject is really the Christian doctrine. By rejecting hastily the entire doctrine because a particular view of it is deemed incredible, we may really be doing immense mischief. No thinking man can fail to see that this doctrine viewed in its essential elements, and apart from any particular rendering, has a momentous bearing on Christian life and upon our whole theological system. In fact, without the contemplated possibility of final and irreversible failure, it is difficult to see how the Christian life could be built up on the lines of Holy Scripture, or how our theological system could remain the same in any one of its parts. By rejecting the doctrine uncritically and in block we may be not only losing hold of a very awful truth, but committing ourselves to a revolution.

If we look at Holy Scripture we find some very awful images of the suffering of hell. In Rev. xx. 10, we read, 'And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented (*βασανισθήσονται*) day and night, for ever and ever.' Immediately after this passage we have a picture of the Day of Judgment, and the description ends with the sentence, 'Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.' This quite agrees with our Lord's own description of the Day of Judgment, Matt. xxv. 41. He is there represented as saying to the wicked, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into [the] everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels;' and afterwards it is said, 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment' (*κόλασις* = chastisement), 'but the righteous into life eternal.' Again, in S. Matt. xiii. 41, we have our Lord saying, 'The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a [or the] furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.' Similarly, in S. Mark ix. 43, he says, 'If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for

thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'

In regard to all these descriptions, it is to be remarked that they are *images*, what the Germans call *Vorstellungen*; and as such they are untheological. Before they can become theological, they must be translated from the image form and rendered into consistent and intelligible thoughts—into what the Germans call *Gedanken*. No doubt, in performing the work of translation, theology must be very careful absolutely to verify the image. She must not explain it away, or translate only a part of it. She must verify it completely, so that everything which lies before the mental eye in the image may be found in the thought. In precisely the same way, the rising of the sun is to science an image; and as such it is unscientific. Before it can be made science it must be translated into a consistent and intelligible thought. And this analogy of scientific procedure suggests an important remark in regard to theology. Science *apparently* contradicts the fact of the sun's rising in the explanation which it gives of it, though it does not really do so. And so it may seem in regard to theology. In the conception or idea which theology may give of the state of the lost there may be an apparent contradiction of the letter of Scripture. The only thing to make sure of is, that, as in science the whole content of the image is rendered in the thought, so it may be in theology.

The popular mind, however, is not theological, just as it is not scientific; nor is it desirable that it should be so. In fact, it is far more effectually taught by means of images than it could be by thoughts. Yet there is a drawback here. The images of the popular mind have a constant tendency to expand and complete themselves, and when they have done so to come before the mind with all the pretensions of theological dogma to the great detriment of Christian faith. In regard, for instance, to the present question, the popular fancy has filled up and fixed the images of Scripture into a state of things which is truly appalling.

Take for, instance, the following description from Mr. Spurgeon:—

'Only conceive that poor wretch in the flames, who is saying "Oh for one drop of water to cool my parched tongue!" See how his tongue hangs from between his blistered lips! How it excoriates and burns the roof of his mouth, as if it were a firebrand! Behold him crying for a drop of water. I will not picture the scene. Suf-

fice it for me to close up by saying, that the hell of hells will be to thee, poor sinner, the thought that it is to be for ever. Thou wilt look up there on the throne of God, and on it shall be written, "For ever!" When the damned jingle the burning irons of their torments, they shall say "For ever!" When they howl, echo cries, "For ever!"

"For ever" is written on their racks;

"For ever," on their chains;

"For ever" burneth in the fire,

"For ever" ever reigns.

Doleful thought! "If I could but get out, then I should be happy. If there were a hope of deliverance, then I might be peaceful; but here I am for ever." Sirs, if ye would escape eternal torments, if ye would be found amongst the number of the blessed, the road to heaven can only be found by prayer.<sup>1</sup>

Or take another picture from a Roman Catholic writer:—

'See on the middle of that red-hot floor stands a girl: she looks about sixteen years old. Her feet are bare. Listen: she speaks, "I have been standing on this red-hot floor for years! Look at my burnt and bleeding feet! Let me go off this burning floor for one moment!" The fifth dungeon is the red-hot oven. The little child is in the red-hot oven. Hear how it screams to come out; see how it turns and twists itself about in the fire. It beats its head against the roof of the oven. It stamps its little feet upon the floor. God was very good to this little child. Very likely God saw it would get worse and worse, and would never repent, and so it would have to be punished more severely in hell. So God in His mercy called it out of the world in early childhood.'<sup>2</sup>

Similar pictures of the torments of hell have been painted by Christians in all ages. Thus S. Cyprian: 'The glowing hell shall burn the damned for ever, and the devouring punishment shall consume them with living flames; nor will there be any means whereby the torments may be sometimes assuaged, or brought to an end.'<sup>3</sup> To a similar effect quotations might be given from Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and indeed from great authorities in all ages of the Church.

But now let us treat these statements theologically. As I have already remarked, it is the business of theology not to deny the statements of revelation, or to evacuate their meaning, but to present them in a consistent and thinkable shape. Now when we come to look at these statements from this point of view, it is seen at once that certain abatements must be made by every one. It is clear that the furnace or fiery

<sup>1</sup> Sermon preached in 1855, quoted in White's *Life in Christ*, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> *Sight of Hell*. By Rev. J. Furniss.

<sup>3</sup> *S. Cyprian. ad Demet.* p. 195.

lake of hell cannot be a furnace such as we kindle in this world, nor can it act upon material bodies such as we at present possess. Unless God reverses all the laws by which He at present governs physical nature, the very first contact of a material body with such a furnace would destroy life, and so hell would come to an end as soon as it began. But we have no right to suppose that God will change the laws of physical nature. Theology must insist strictly upon this point; for if it is not granted, there is an end to all reasoning upon the subject. Indeed those who draw conclusions and maintain dogmas in defiance of physical law, are not aware of the consequences of their procedure if carried out to its logical conclusion. It would simply destroy all theological knowledge; for it would destroy the very elements of knowledge itself. We may therefore conclude that the lake of hell cannot be a furnace such as we kindle, nor can the bodies that are subjected to it be material bodies, such as we at present possess. Indeed this conclusion is forced upon us from other considerations. The fire of the intermediate state is burning at the present moment, and those who are subjected to it have left their material bodies in this world. The bodies therefore which they at present possess, or whatever may serve in place of bodies, cannot be material; nor can the fire which burns them be such as we kindle, for clearly it does not belong to the material or visible world, but exists in the recesses of the invisible. In like manner, in regard to the eternal fire of hell, we are told that ere it is kindled all this visible world, with its matter and of course also with its fire, will have passed away.

In face of these difficulties, even the most determined literalists have felt compelled to make some abatement. Thus Lactantius, in a statement which we slightly abbreviate, says:—

‘Since men have contracted defilement in their bodies they shall again be clad in the flesh. Yet that flesh shall not be like this earthly flesh, but indissoluble and for ever permanent, that it may be apt to endure the torments and the eternal fire; which fire also is of a different nature from ours. Ours needs to be fed, but that lives for ever of itself, without any aliment, and without admixture of smoke, and is pure, liquid, and fluid like water. Whence by one and the same power, it will burn the wicked and recreate them, and just as much as it consumes from their bodies it will replace, and will administer to itself an eternal food.’<sup>1</sup>

An exactly similar idea is contained in Minucius Felix,

<sup>1</sup> Lactantius vii. 21.

who speaks of the fire as that which *urit et reficit, carpit et nutrit*. We need not stop to inquire whether this rendering is the best possible, or whether, with our enlarged notions of physical law, we might not give a better. All that we have to do is to point out the enormous distance that lies between such a view and the 'blistered lips' and 'burnt and bleeding feet' of the popular conception.

But we find, on a closer consideration, that we cannot stop short even with this considerable abatement. It is to be observed that in the New Testament and in the Primitive Fathers, three separate chastening fires are contemplated. There is, first, the fire of the intermediate state; secondly, the fire which is kindled at the Day of Judgment; and, thirdly, the lake of fire into which the wicked are finally cast after the judgment. The idea of the first is grounded on the parable of Dives and Lazarus. Thus S. Hilary says—

'The vengeance of hell overtakes us at once, and immediately we depart from the body, if we have so lived, "we perish from the right way." The rich and poor man in the Gospel show us this; the one placed by angels in the abode of the blessed, and in Abraham's bosom, the other at once received into the place of punishment. So quickly did punishment come upon the dead, that even his brothers were still alive. There is no deferring or delaying there. For, as the day of judgment is the eternal award either of bliss or of punishment, so the time of death orders the interval for every man by its own laws, committing every one to Abraham or to punishment till the judgment.'<sup>1</sup>

The idea of the fire of judgment is grounded on 1 Cor. iii. 13, and on the passage which describes the world as being burned up. Some seem to have spoken of this as if it were the kindling of the eternal fire; and it was believed that all would have to pass through it, with this remarkable difference, that the righteous would escape unscathed, while the wicked would sink and be buried in it. Thus Origen says—'But how some remain in the fire, others escape through it, learn from another Scripture. The Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, the Israelites passed over; Moses passed through, Pharaoh sank, for his heavy sins drowned him. In like manner, the irreligious will sink in the lake of burning fire.'<sup>2</sup>

Thus the fire of the intermediate state, the fire of judgment, and the lake of eternal fire were so far identified that

<sup>1</sup> S. Hilary in Psalm ii. sec. 48. See a number of similar passages from various Fathers quoted in *Bishop Forbes on the Articles*, ii. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Origen in Psalm xxxvi. note 26, i. 790, Ben.

they were regarded as belonging to one system. Now what we have particularly to attend to is this. An attribute of a very remarkable character was assigned to these fires, and this attribute was derived from or grounded on the saying of S. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 13. These fires possess the singular property of discrimination. They attack the sinful soul, and permit the righteous to escape; they attack fiercely the utterly wicked, and more mildly the less wicked. Thus S. Ephrem, speaking of the fire of judgment, says—'Both the just and the unjust shall pass through the fire which is to try them, and shall be proved by it; the righteous pass and the flame is quiet; but it burneth the wicked and snatcheth him away.' The eternal flames of hell possessed a similar property, inflicting a great degree of torture on the most wicked, and a lesser degree on the less. Thus S. Augustine remarks, 'It is, however, by no means to be denied that even the eternal fire, according to the diversity of evil merit, will be lighter to some and more grievous to others: whether it be that its strength and fierceness are varied to inflict the merited pain, or it burns uniformly, but is not equally felt.'<sup>1</sup> In consequence of this peculiarity the fire was called *πῦρ σοφρονούν*, *ignis sapiens*.

If now we take into consideration this peculiarity we shall see that the difficulty of maintaining a literal fire becomes greater. What kind of a fire can that be which possesses the character of wisdom and discrimination, which knows whom to burn and whom to spare? It cannot be literal fire, such as we know it, for the peculiarity of literal fire is that it acts invariably. This fire, on the other hand, does not so act, but possesses all the discrimination which belongs to a mind. If we were to convert this property into something like an intelligible idea or notion, we might say that the fire is providential, or is an instrument of God's Providence. For, clearly, we must suppose that the will and mind of God lies behind it, directing it whom to attack and whom to spare. But the moment we look at the matter in this point of view we open the door to the metaphorical rendering. May not the image of fire be simply a mode of expressing the system of treatment or discipline to which God subjects the lost? God's anger is spoken of in Scripture as a consuming fire. God is represented as purging Jerusalem by the 'spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning;' and our Lord came to kindle a fire upon earth, which is even now burning. Under

<sup>1</sup> S. Aug. *De Civ. Dei* xxi. 15.



this point of view may we not suppose that the lake of fire simply indicates the awful severity of that system of chastisement to which the lost shall be subjected, the exact particulars of which are unknown to us?

The metaphorical rendering has always been allowed in the Church. Yet we must confess, while allowing due weight to it, that we have great difficulty in altogether accepting it. The fire is spoken of in Holy Scripture so persistently, and in such a way as seems to imply the reality, if not of literal fire, at least of its analogue; some real pain, of which the burning in literal fire is to us the most expressive image. On the supposition, too, that God's system of dealing with the lost is on the whole a merciful one, it would seem that some such agony as that represented by the fire were absolutely needed. It is to be observed that in this world consciences are for the most part asleep. The sinner has no true idea of the awfulness of his guilt. But the effect of the great judgment will be that all consciences will be awakened. Men will then see their sins in the light in which God sees them; and it is not obscurely intimated that the agony arising from this awakening will be all but unbearable. It is said, they shall call on the mountains and rocks to fall on them and hide them from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb. Under these circumstances it would seem that something like the agony of the fire would be needed to restore the sinner to mental equilibrium.

But on the supposition that the fire or its analogue is real, and that it gives real physical pain, an important question arises, is the pain of burning continuous? Does the acute torment the fire inflicts go on uninterruptedly? Are the lost always in the fire, or are they only there for a time, and for a special chastisement, and at other times are not in it? The general opinion has been that the lost are always in the fire, and that they suffer uninterruptedly; the only alleviation being that some have maintained a doctrine of mitigation. Yet a little reflection will show the immense difficulty of this supposition. No doubt, physically speaking, the thing is perfectly possible. The difficulties which beset Lactantius in his endeavours to render the flames of hell intelligible do not beset us. We have no need like him to have recourse to miracle. On the contrary, physical science has afforded us the means of picturing easily what an eternal unfed fire might be. Physically, therefore, we might allow it to be possible; but if we look at the matter in reference to mind it is hardly, if at all conceiv-

able. The sensation of burning being the acutest agony that we can imagine, would, according to all mental laws, if continued uninterruptedly, reduce the mind to impotence. Of course we can only reason on the basis of our present mental constitution; and taking that as our basis, we see that a single sensation of acute agony would be practically no sensation at all. Constituted as our minds are at present, sensation is only possible under the law of difference. We only know light by the contrast of darkness. Were there no darkness there could be no light. And so of other things. Pain is only possible in contrast with pleasure or ease. Hence we see that a soul subjected to the agony of excruciating pain without the contrast of ease or rest would in time not suffer at all, would in fact be reduced to complete impotence.

If we turn to Holy Scripture we find nothing to indicate such uninterrupted pain, but rather the contrary. The lake of fire is not the only image under which the punishment of the lost is represented. In S. Luke xii. 47, it is represented under the figure of stripes; some, it is said, are beaten with few and some with many stripes. Now, this figure of stripes necessarily conveys to us the idea of interruption. The most savage of masters does not always beat his slave. There are intervals of release from suffering; nor are the stripes applied again, unless there is at least a pretext that they are needed for purposes of correction. And this figure of the stripes would seem to indicate that so it is with the lost. But this is not the only Scriptural ground tending in the same direction. Our Lord says of the wicked that they are to go away into *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, eternal chastisement. How could such chastisement be conceived as uninterrupted? If it were uninterrupted it would not be chastisement; for the very idea of chastisement seems to imply the application of stripes only when needed. We think, too, that the same idea, though under a slightly different form, is conveyed in the word *βασανισθήσονται*, which is used in the Revelation. The only thing against this view is that the fire of hell is called unquenchable, eternal; but might not this merely mean that the corrective suffering indicated by the fire is always there ready to be applied in case of necessity? If we are right in our supposition, our Lord's phrase, *κόλασις αἰώνιος*, might be taken as indicating the principle on which the society of hell is constituted. Hell is a place which is governed on the principle of coercion or chastisement.

Here it seems necessary to somewhat widen our view by taking other things into consideration. If we look at human

society as at present constituted we see how God has laid His hand firmly upon it and subjected it to inexorable laws, and in the simplest way imaginable. Man needs food, clothing, and shelter; and the effect of these three wants is that he becomes tied to the soil, and society assumes external order. The same wants, likewise, give rise to the idea of property, which constitutes the central point around which human society moves; and this idea in its turn gives rise to the idea of rights. Now how is it that the ideas of property and of right are enforced? It is by means of penalties; so that human society as at present constituted is governed on the principle of *κόλασις*.

Now our Blessed Lord never concealed his view that human society is grounded on a wrong principle, or on a principle which is imperfect as being suited only for fallen beings, and which can at best only serve as a makeshift. He especially attacked the principle of property as being the principle of selfishness. Personally He possessed nothing, and He required his perfect followers to be like Himself. Thus He gave the command, 'Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.' In opposition to the principle of property with its enforcements and penalties, He laid down as that on which a perfect society might be constituted the principle of self-sacrificing love. Unless we get this central idea of Christ clearly into view, it is impossible to understand the meaning and drift of much of His teaching. It was in pursuance of this cardinal principle of love that He required the giving up of all things, the utter renunciation of self, and the taking up of the cross. It was as being utterly opposed to and subversive of the same principle that He proscribed entirely the feeling and act of revenge; requiring His followers to turn the other cheek to the smiter. Christ's enthusiastic followers have tried more or less to realise His idea in this world, though, as might be expected, with indifferent success. The infant Church, for instance, tried the principle of having all things in common, though they had soon to give it up; and the religious orders with more success have tried to realise the idea of self-renunciation and poverty. Yet though we may allow that constituted as human society is, and must be, in this world, Christ's idea is impossible; yet we shall egregiously err if we suppose that it has been inoperative. On the contrary, it has ever been the ideal of the Christian life, and to the influence of that ideal human society owes all the ameliorations which Christianity has conferred upon it.

But if Christ's idea cannot be realised in this world, may it not be in the world to come? If, indeed, it could be realised, we see at once that a society would be constituted on a totally different principle from that of *κόλασις*, and ineffably above it. And may not the discipline of the present life be intended to prepare souls to be members of such a perfect society? In this point of view the whole system of the Christian Church first becomes intelligible, for every part of that system is ordered with a view to charity or love, which S. Paul says is the end of the commandment. If it be so, that the eternal society of Christ's kingdom is to be constituted on the principle of love, we see why at baptism we are raised to the dignity of sons, and habitual love or justifying grace is implanted in our souls. We see why all the other means of grace are directed to the end of renewing or strengthening it. In fact, theology has expressed this central idea by making our spiritual life depend upon our having or not having love. To have love is to have life, that eternal life of which Christ spoke so much; not to have it is to be dead.

Now, in the light of these views, let us turn back to the punishment of the lost, and see whether some light is not thrown upon it. If we suppose that the damned are those who do not possess the principle of love, and who have so lived as to be incapable of it, may it not be that damnation is the assigning to them a lot outside the kingdom of Christ? They are to be formed into a society of their own, a society formed on a totally different principle from that of self-sacrificing love; and how should we designate that principle but as that of a state of *κόλασις*? The damned have refused the dignity of sons, they are consequently condemned to be servants; they refused the liberty of the children of God, and they are deprived of their freedom; they refused to obey God out of love, they are compelled to obey Him by chastisement. If we look at the classical and most complete passage in which our blessed Lord laid down the doctrine of eternal punishment, there is much in it to suggest this view. The sentence on the wicked, no doubt, is 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels;' but these words may be held to be interpreted by the final summing-up, in which the eternal chastisement of the wicked is contrasted with the eternal life of the righteous. But what, perhaps, more than anything else suggests this view is the *ground* on which the final condemnation rests. The wicked are separated not on the ground of their sins,

but on the ground of defect ; and that in which they are deficient is precisely the virtue of love. 'I was an hungred and ye gave me no meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink, a stranger and ye took me not in, naked and ye clothed me not, sick and in prison and ye visited me not.' These are the very works of love, and the meaning seems to be that not possessing that principle which is the principle on which the eternal kingdom of Christ is founded, they are unfit for it, and must have their portion without. The society of which they are to form part must be bound together by the principle of chastisement or coercion, not by the principle of love.

The principal conclusions, then, at which we arrive regarding the state of the lost are the following. Hell must be a society of human beings, and of course as such must have a principle of government. This principle we suppose to be coercion or chastisement in opposition to the principle which rules in heaven, which is self-sacrificing love. Further, it would appear that hell is not one society, but is made up of a vast number of societies ; for the Church, following the idea of 'few' and 'many' stripes, has always held that there are different degrees of punishment according to the different degrees of guilt and degradation. If we are right in supposing that the pain and chastisement of hell is not uninterrupted, we may suppose that after enduring the punishment of past sin, souls would be left free to follow their tastes and likings within the limits assigned to them, and that chastisement would only be applied again in case of fresh sin and insubordination. In the higher societies, as the more human and orderly, we may suppose the coercive power would be less severely applied as not being needed ; in the lower it would be more sharp and stinging. In regard to the moral condition of these societies there is no need to suppose that it is an utter wreck. Indeed, in regard to the *limbus puerorum*, which, according to mediæval theology, constitutes the highest society of hell, S. Thomas Aquinas remarks that the souls confined there are joined to God through the participation of *natural* good. It is true that an opposite idea has very generally prevailed. Rothe, for instance, supposes that the wicked are finally fixed in evil (*dämonisirt*) ; but this is a horrible idea, and in the absence of any direct proof we may be permitted to reject it. It might, perhaps, be true to some extent, of the lowest societies, the penal settlements so to speak ; but in the higher we conceive there would be degrees of moral state, very much as it is now.

In regard to the kind of life that will be led, we of course know nothing, just as we know nothing of the life of heaven. So far, however, we might, perhaps, venture to guess, that in one point of view the life of hell would be higher, in another infinitely lower, than the present. We know that the resurrection body possesses a higher constitution than our present bodies, and is thus capable of higher degrees of suffering and enjoyment. The soul, too, after passing through the intermediate state and the trial of the judgment, must be greatly enlarged in knowledge and capacity. It is thus conceivable that so far as *natural* appliances are concerned, the life of hell might be an advance on the present. It might have what we call a higher and more perfect civilisation. In another point of view, however, it must be inconceivably lower. What sweetens and gives all the zest to the present life is hope. We not only have 'access to the Father,' but we have hope of endless progress in the future; we have hope of being in the end all that God meant us to be. In hell there is no hope, but the crushing sense of failure.

Before passing from this point it may be right to notice an objection that possibly might be urged. It may be said this view is too lenient, and much might be urged in support, not only from the letter of Scripture, but from our religious nature.

The religious sentiment is grounded on the utter abhorrence of sin. To the religious mind sin is something which is utterly and eternally damnable; it deserves an infinite punishment; ages and ages, even an eternity of torment, would not suffice to expiate it. Now, this feeling is perfectly true, and there is much in Holy Scripture which answers to it. If taken subjectively and as the measure to be applied to our own sins, it is indispensably necessary. But may we translate it into an objective truth, and regard it as the principle on which God will judge the world? The two things, it will be seen, are very different. An eternity of torment as the measure of my own individual sin is one thing, the consigning of a soul to eternal, uninterrupted torment by God, the Judge of all, is another. May we not suppose that God has other standards of judgment besides those which apply subjectively to the loving and religious soul? And if so, it is clear we should form a false view of the state of the lost if we gained it solely by reasoning from subjective views of the nature of sin.

But is not our conception terrible enough even after the withdrawal of the idea of uninterrupted eternal torment?



Only conceive such agony as is represented by the image of fire, lasting for a year, a month, or even a day, and is not the prospect of hell terrible enough? But, after all, the agony of the fire is not that which makes up what is emphatically the bitterness of hell. From the earliest times divines have considered the punishment of hell under two aspects, as consisting in one point of view of the *pæna damni*, and in another of the *pæna sensus*; and the general opinion has been that in view of the *pæna damni*, the *pæna sensus* is comparatively unimportant. Many have denied altogether the reality of the fire, and have taken the expressions denoting it metaphorically. S. Gregory of Nyssa, for instance, denies that the fire of hell is a material fire, and that the worm is an *ἐντρίχειον θηρίον*. For reasons we have given, we think this is going too far. But even so, it would still be true that there is an element in damnation which is far more bitter than the lake of fire; in view of which the lake of fire might even be regarded as a merciful provision.

Let us try to realise what damnation really is. In the first place, it is the judgment of God, and as such is infallibly true. Must not that to the lost be infinitely terrible? If in this life men can hardly face the reprobation of their fellow-men, what agony must it be to endure the reprobation of God, and to know for certain that life has been a failure. Then, in the second place, there is the bitter knowledge of all that has been lost. In this world we have inadequate views of the glory of heaven; inevitably it is so, because we are expressly told it is so great as to surpass our power even of conception. But, after passing through the intermediate state and the judgment, it will be different. The lost will have actual proof of that ineffable state of exaltation which seems to be indicated in words like these—'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father.' Who shall conceive the anguish of the thought of such a state, compared with the lot they have earned for themselves? 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.'

And now let us turn to consider the opposite doctrine, which, rejecting the doctrine of eternal punishment, proposes to substitute for it the doctrine of the final restoration of all.

One of the strongest indictments of the doctrine of eternal punishment which we have ever seen, is contained in a letter of the late Mr. John Forster, addressed to the Rev.

E. White.<sup>1</sup> And as the position taken up by Mr. Forster might be considered as the strongest basis *on natural grounds* of the doctrine of Restitution, we shall take it as the starting-point for the remarks we have to make.

Mr. Forster's great objection to the orthodox doctrine of the punishment of the lost, lies in its eternity. He remarks that people never make an effort to try to realise what eternity is : if they would do so they would see how irresistible the strength of the moral argument against eternal punishment really is. But how can we realise eternity? Only by considering what it is not. We must try to realise the vastest measures of *time*, and look to the termination of these as only touching the mere commencement of eternity.

'For example :—It has been suggested to imagine the number of particles or atoms contained in this globe, and suppose them one by one annihilated, each in a thousand years, till all were gone ; but just as well say a million, or a million of millions of years or ages, it is all the same as against infinite duration.'

Then after some other examples of vast periods, he goes on—

'Now think of an infliction of misery protracted through such a period, and at the end of it being only *commencing*,—not one smallest step nearer a conclusion :—the case just the same if that sum of figures were multiplied by itself. And then think of *Man*—his nature, his situation, the circumstances of his brief sojourn and trial upon earth. Far be it from us to make light of the demerit of sin, and to remonstrate with the Supreme Judge against a severe chastisement, of whatever moral nature we may regard the infliction to be. But still, what is man? He comes into the world with a nature fatally corrupt, and powerfully tending to actual evil. He comes among a crowd of temptations adapted to his innate evil propensities. He grows up (incomparably the greater proportion of the race) in great ignorance ; his judgment weak ; and under numberless beguilements into error ; while his passions and appetites are strong ; his conscience unequally matched against their power ;—in the majority of men but feebly and rudely constituted. The influence of whatever good instructions he may receive is counteracted by a combination of opposite influences almost constantly acting upon him. He is essentially and inevitably unapt to be powerfully acted on by what is invisible and future. In addition to all which, there is the intervention and activity of the great tempter and destroyer.

'I acknowledge my inability (I would say it reverently) to admit this belief, together with a belief in the Divine Goodness—the belief that "God is love," that His tender mercies are over all His works. . . . How would all our ideas be confounded, while contemplating

<sup>1</sup> *Life in Christ*, p. 67.

Him bringing, of His own sovereign will, a race of creatures into existence, in such a condition that they certainly will and must,—*must* by their nature and circumstances, go wrong and be miserable, unless prevented by especial grace,—which is the privilege of only a small proportion of them, and, at the same time affixing on their delinquency a doom, of which it is absolutely beyond the highest archangel's faculty to apprehend a thousandth part of the horror. . . .

'But it is usually alleged that there will be an endless *continuance* of sinning, with probably an endless aggravation, and *therefore* the punishment must be endless. Is not this like an admission of disproportion between the punishment and the *original cause* of infliction? But suppose the case to be so—that is to say, that the punishment is not a retribution *simply* for the guilt of the momentary existence on earth, but a continued punishment of the continued, ever aggravated guilt in the eternal state; the allegation is of no avail in vindication of the doctrine; because the first consignment to the dreadful state *necessitates a continuance of the criminality*; the doctrine teaching that it is of the essence, and is an awful aggravation, of the original consignment, that it dooms the condemned to maintain the criminal spirit unchanged for ever. The doom to *sin*, as well as suffer, and, according to the argument, to *sin in order* to suffer, is inflicted as the punishment of the sin committed in the mortal state. Virtually, therefore, the eternal punishment is the punishment of the sins of time.'

And then he remarks, under the light [or darkness] of this doctrine, how awful is the economy of this human world!

Now, it is evident that the very pith and marrow of the case here presented, has already been removed if the view of everlasting punishment which we have given above be accepted. Mr. Forster's reasoning reposes on the popular conception of uninterrupted eternal burning, and the reduction of the lost to the state of demons. But we have found reason to question both of these positions. We imagine that what Holy Scripture teaches of hell is, that it is a state of government by stripes; that after the penalty for past sin has been paid in the fire, coercive discipline is not resorted to except in case of insubordination. And for the rest, there is nothing to show but that God may do for the damned the very best of which they are susceptible. It is true, they are for ever deprived of supernatural good, but there is the whole field of natural good which may be awarded to them in proportion to their deserts. It is clear, therefore, that after the elimination of these wrong prepossessions, the case of Mr. Forster well nigh breaks down.

Still, however, it would be uncandid not to admit, that,

even after the removal of these false views, the damned are to all eternity deprived of the inheritance. They are reduced to a state of being infinitely below what God purposed for man. They are in 'outer darkness' so far as the light of God's countenance is concerned; and instead of living in a state of love and freedom, they are in a state of compulsory subjection. It may be asked—Is this consistent with the goodness of God? Might we not rather expect that He would award the highest good to all? And this argument is strengthened by the considerations Mr. Forster brings forward with the view of showing, that the majority of men have not a fair chance. Now, let us for the present postpone the question of whether men have or have not a fair chance, and address ourselves to the great question, whether hell being a deprivation of supernatural good, it is consistent with God's goodness to permit a portion of the human race to fall into it.

Now, if our contention that in hell the punishment is not out of proportion to the guilt, and further that God gives even in hell natural good in proportion to desert, is admitted, the question assumes this character. Is it consistent with the goodness of God to create some creatures to a higher and some to a lower good? or if He create at all, is He bound in justice to create all to the highest good? In addressing ourselves to this question, we cannot help remarking that S. Paul has scanty patience with those who adopt the latter alternative. He asks, indignantly: 'Hath not the potter power over the clay to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?' And this is perfectly conclusive. Nevertheless, we may look about to see, whether there are not facts which when calmly weighed will bear it out. Of course we can only reason of God from the *facts* of His Providence, of which we have experience. It is very easy to follow the high *a priori* road, and to lay down a course of conduct for the Almighty which we think He ought to follow. But such reasonings are in the highest degree insecure and baseless. God has revealed Himself in nature, as well as in revelation, and no ideas of His character and procedure are at all worthy of consideration, unless gathered by a cautious induction from the analogy of nature. Now if we look at nature, we see broadly written upon it the fact of inequality. God has not thought it right to endow His creatures with the same powers and the same advantages. We see a gradation in the animal kingdom, from the lowest living forms up to man. And then, within the sphere of humanity there is the same inequality,

both in respect of natural endowments and condition of life. Even within the kingdom of Christ there are the same gradations, and the Scripture indicates that so it will be for ever. In the eternal kingdom, while some are only citizens, we are given to understand that there are others who will be rulers over five and ten cities. There is nothing, therefore, in the analogy of nature, that would lead us to conclude, that there is anything contrary to the goodness of God, in assigning to those who are unfit for anything else their portion outside the kingdom of Christ.

But still it may be asked, would it not be more worthy of God, to restore all, and admit all, into the kingdom of Christ? Yes, perhaps; provided only that human souls are like counters, to be played with, and sorted as we please! Here, in fact, we touch the very kernel of the question, of the final restoration of all, so far as philosophical considerations are concerned. Is the thing possible, human nature being what it is? It is easy of course to blink this question, to assume without inquiry the possibility of restoring all, and then to set forward on the easy path of optimistic speculation. Nevertheless, to any one who chooses to take note of the facts of human nature, the whole theory must appear in utter and hopeless contradiction to them. Here, however, we find ourselves in a difficulty. How shall we make this clear in the few pages at our disposal? Perhaps the best way of eliciting the incongruity will be to address ourselves to the simple practical question—How is the thing to be done?

Now Calvinism has a very compact theory on the subject. According to Calvinism, man's free-will has been utterly destroyed by the fall. In theological language the fall reduced man to such a state of impotence, that it is true to say of him *non potest non peccare*. Hence man's conversion is entirely the work of God, and it possesses the character of a miracle. Conversion, however, is only one half of our restoration; after our conversion we are still in a state of utter depravity; but Calvinism looks forward to another miracle, whereby at the moment of death the elect will be suddenly transformed into a state of angelic perfection, and so fitted to reign with Christ. Now, it is clear, if these premisses are admitted, the Restitutionist might well demand of the Calvinist whether it would not be more accordant with the goodness of God to perform the same miracle upon all. Nor, indeed, do we see how, upon Calvinistic principles, any satisfactory answer could be given to this question. But is this theory of man's restoration true?

There is no evidence in Holy Scripture tending to show that God will ever perform such a miracle; and clearly the supposition that He will do so stands in complete contradiction with God's usual dealing. According to God's ordinary dealing, man's restoration is a gradual process, freely worked out by himself. Constituted as we are, our characters, i.e., our states of moral perfection or imperfection, are the effect of those of our past acts, that have been *freely* chosen by the will; nor can we even conceive the possibility of a man's being other than what he has in this way *freely* made himself. But according to the Calvinistic theory, the moral state to which we are elevated by this supposed miracle, is effected by a power which works altogether independent of the will. No doubt Calvinism is right in its affirmation that no amelioration, moral or spiritual, can be effected in man, except by the power of Divine grace; but it is utterly wrong in affirming that it is effected without the co-operation of the will. The Catholic Church has ever taught that the human will must co-operate; that the human will has the power of accepting or rejecting; and that if it accepts, the amelioration effected is non-miraculous, is, in fact, a process quite in the course of ordinary human progress.

We may therefore set aside this Calvinistic theory, as involving a breach of continuity, and for that reason being quite unthinkable.

But it may be said, dismissing the notion of a miraculous restoration, such as Calvinism teaches, might not men be restored by a system of discipline extending into ages beyond the grave? This is the theory of Mr. Jukes, the Scriptural grounds for which we shall presently advert to. Here we deal with the question on purely natural considerations. Now granting that there are such ages, and that men are subjected to such discipline with a view to restoration, on what ground are we to conclude that it would be probably successful? Mr. Jukes alleges that the restoration is to be effected through the instrumentality of death and judgment. His theory, so far as we can make it out, is that some are converted through God's providential dealing in this world. They are the elect or first fruits. Others are converted by the judgments and sufferings of the age immediately succeeding, or, as we should prefer to call it, the intermediate state; while those who still remain unconverted are finally subdued by the great judgment, and the lake of fire, which is the second death. Certainly Mr. Jukes is perfectly right in pointing out that judgment and death are the only ways by which a poor sinner can return



to God ; nor would we say one word in detriment of the precious sacramental efficacy of these and all other dispensations of God's providence. But that is hardly the point which needs to be cleared up. The point is, What ground have we for believing that these Divine dispensations will have the intended effect upon all ? Mr. Jukes, so far as we can see, brings no evidence to clear up this ; and of course in the absence of evidence we can only resort to the teaching of experience. Have we any reason for believing that God's judgments will exert their intended effect upon all ? that all will take up the cross sent to them, and follow Christ. Experience surely gives us no ground for such an expectation. Experience teaches the awful fact that the judgments of God may be ineffectual ; and that when they are so, they only tend to harden and confirm the soul in wrong-doing. It is a simple fact of experience, that, notwithstanding all the pleading of God with the soul, in the marvellous disposition of the events of a man's life, many souls live estranged from Him, and die in sin.

But it may be said—granted that the discipline of this life is ineffectual in many cases, still, the theory teaches that God has not done with a soul when this life is over. Those whom the discipline of this life has failed to recover, will be subjected to the sharper discipline of the life to come ; and if that still fails, to the sharpest discipline of all, viz., the great judgment and the lake of fire, which is the second death. Now we would ask the reader to pause and calmly ask himself what kind of a conversion would that be ? The sinner, after having held out against all God's loving correction, held out against his severer chastisement, held out to the very end, is only turned by the inexpressible agony of the second death. Would it not be manifestly a *forced* conversion ? And if forced, we naturally ask, of what use would the soul so converted be for the purposes of Christ's kingdom ? Surely none at all. Up to the last moment its whole bent and tendency was in a direction contrary to Christ's kingdom ; and only at the last moment, when utterly broken down by intense agony, did it turn. What can such a turning be but the putting on of the *semblance* of the new life ?

But there is more than this. This theory of the restoration of all comes before us as a theory of mercy. Is it after all really merciful ? God has chosen to create man free ; and we can see that by so doing He gains from His creatures, from those at least who *freely* choose Him, a love and service inexpressibly higher and more precious than He could have

gained from creatures not free. But when God created man free He must have foreseen that some would use their freedom to follow their own ways. Is it really merciful to coerce them in this terrible manner into following a way which is not their own? Would it not be more merciful to leave them to their own ways, and give them such provision for following those ways as He may deem fitting?

I have said that such a conversion as Restorationism supposes must be forced, and some may demur to this. But if we think of it we shall see that there is only one way in which we can possibly conceive it as not forced, viz., by supposing that God at the last moment performs a miracle such as Calvinism supposes. If we suppose that at the last moment God suddenly and miraculously changes the whole nature and bent of the lost soul, then we grant the conversion would be real. But, in that case, we naturally ask, Why did not God perform the miracle sooner? Calvinism is logical, so far, in insisting that the miracle takes place at the moment of death, and in denying altogether the existence of an intermediate state. Surely, it is illogical, to accept the intermediate state with all its discipline, *in lieu of the miracle*, and then in the end to have recourse to the miracle. In that case to what purpose is all the suffering of the intermediate state? To what purpose the lake of fire? Confessedly they fail in effecting the end for which they are postulated; the end can only be effected by the miracle. But, if so, how shall we defend the goodness of God in subjecting His creatures to such torments?

The conclusion, then, at which we arrive on purely natural grounds is, that this idea of the final restoration of all is in utter and hopeless conflict with all the facts of human nature.

To pass on to another point. Let us now inquire how far we may be justified in extending the idea of a state of trial beyond the grave. It is urged in support of such extension, that many men, from circumstances over which they have no control, have not a fair chance in this world; whence, it is argued, it is reasonable to suppose that God may permit an extension of trial under circumstances which are more favourable. If we inquire what those circumstances are, we find that what is specially urged by Mr. Forster is our 'nature fatally corrupt and powerfully tending to evil,' the great ignorance of incomparably the greatest portion of men, the strength of passion, the weakness of conscience. Mr. Cox, in a similar way, asks:

'Who dare say of any class of men, in any age, that nothing but

their own will prevented their salvation? There are thousands and tens of thousands in this Christian land to-day who have never had a fair chance of being quickened into life. Conceived in sin, and shapen in iniquity, inheriting defects of will and taints of blood, cradled in ignorance and vice, they have hardly heard the name of Christ save as a word to curse by. And there are thousands and myriads more to whom the faith of Christ has been presented in forms so meagre and narrow, or in forms so fictitious and theatrical, that the only wonder is that so many of them care to worship Him at all. And with all these in our midst, now that the Gospel has been preached among us for a thousand years, which of us will dare to affirm that those ancient sinners of Sodom, born in an age so dark, reared in "fulness of bread and abundance of idleness," enervated by a tropical climate and by the abominations amid which they were nurtured, had *all* that men needed in order that they might know the only true God and serve Him alone?

And then, after a few further remarks, he asks :

'What *shall* we say then? For myself, I can only say, that I see no way out of the difficulty, no single loophole of escape, so long as we assume what the Bible does not teach, that there is no probation beyond the grave, that no moral change is possible in that world towards which all the children of time are travelling.'

Now we so far admit the force of these pleas that we imagine they constitute a strong argument for the existence of the intermediate state with all its discipline. It is reasonable to suppose that those who have never in this world heard the name of Christ, should hear it in the world to come. It is reasonable to suppose that those who have been born and educated in a state of life fatally corrupt, and who have not been aware of its corruption, should have their eyes opened to that corruption. Nay, we think, it is even reasonable that those who, living in a high state of civilisation have been misled by false reasoning into doubt or atheism, should have their eyes opened to the truth. And admitting all this, we must necessarily admit its reasonable consequence, viz. that many souls who have hitherto groped in darkness, not knowing it to be darkness, nor knowing its contrary the light, will be irresistibly drawn to the light when it is made known to them. Socrates, for instance, and Plato, and many a sage unknown to fame, have never heard the name of Christ, nor known of His kingdom, in this world; in the world in which they now are they may not only have heard of Him, but actually have seen Him; and it may be the moment they saw Him, the moment it was made known to them what His kingdom is, they bent down in adoration and love. So too many poor

souls, not philosophers at all, many a heathen trained in barbarity and vice, like the Red Indian, not even knowing what virtue or purity is, may, in like manner, as soon as they saw Him, have been irresistibly drawn to Him; nor only so, but joyfully have submitted to that discipline which in the providence of God was to undo the past and perfect them in the image of Christ. In fact, it is reasonable to suppose that God will afford to every one all that is necessary to salvation; that Christ's kingdom will be made up of the cream of humanity, gathered out of every nation and every clime; in fine, that every human being who is susceptible of salvation will be saved.

And yet admitting all this, we cannot admit with Mr. Cox that there is a 'probation beyond the grave.' On the contrary, we believe most firmly with the Catholic Church of all ages, that the great battle of a man's destiny is fought and decided in this world. The whole purpose of the discipline of the intermediate state is of a totally different character from the discipline of this life. In this life we are, in the proper sense of the word, in a state of probation; the discipline of this life is intended to prove us, whether we will serve the Lord. In the intermediate state, on the other hand, the discipline is intended for undoing evil, and perfecting the good work in those who have been proved and accepted. It appears to us that this idea of probation beyond the grave is one of the most serious errors of the theory of Restitutionism. Its advocates forget that in this life we grow up to maturity, and that the character is formed for good or evil. Our destiny is thus practically decided; nor can we see any purpose which a prolongation of probation would really serve.

It appears to us that in advocating a prolongation of probation, Restitutionists have laid too much stress upon the accidental adjuncts of a man's life, and too little on the marvellous working of God's providence, in arranging the events and trials that constitute our life. Granted that a man is a member of a vicious and corrupt society; granted that he has never heard the name of Christ, or heard it only as a name to curse by; granted that instead of true religion he has been trained in the abominations of a false one:—granting all these things, may not a man be sufficiently *proved* by the events and trials of his life? It is said that God takes care of oxen, nay even of sparrows: may we not therefore suppose that He takes a special care of human beings? Are not all the events and trials of a man's life specially arranged in His providence? and may we not suppose, so wisely and

mercifully arranged, that they shall sift a man to the very core? In the case of the heathen and the outcast, may they not be ordered to this very end, to bring the man to such a point, that when in the invisible world the light of Christ is first shed upon his soul, he shall either be drawn or repelled.

In denying that a state of probation is continued beyond the grave we desire not to be misunderstood. It is not as if there were any fixed law prohibiting repentance. To maintain such a view would be going beyond the teaching of the Church. The Eastern Church has always maintained that it is just possible for a soul in the intermediate state to pass from the awful to the joyful anticipation. It is not so much that Almighty God refuses to receive repentance, as that repentance is no longer practicable. We may speak of repentances in the intermediate state, in much the same way as we speak of death-bed repentances. Who would dare to deny that God would receive a death-bed repentance, provided only it were sincere? And yet we are justified in warning men not to trust to them. We are justified in believing that the vast majority of them are false and delusive. We know this in many of those cases which seemed to be death, and which were not really so. We know that on rising from the bed of death the penitent forgot his vows, and speedily returned to his former life. And may it not be the same with many others who really died? As long as they were in the body, borne down by the burden of the flesh, they were penitent; but the moment they shook off the trammels of mortality, the moment they started up in the intermediate state, again in the full vigour of life, may they not have recurred, as others did, to their habitual frame of mind? There is as much truth as there is exquisite wit in the old couplet—

‘When the devil was sick,  
The devil a monk would be,  
But when the devil got well  
The devil a monk was he.’

And, surely, in this point of view we see the inexpressible cruelty of this view of probation beyond the grave. If it be so, that the battle of a man's destiny is practically fought in this life, how cruel to tell men that it is not so! How cruel would it be to say to a young man,—You may revel in riot, you may take your fill of pleasure, you may shirk work and duty, and squander your time in idleness; you will thereby bring upon yourself a heavy chastisement, but *you will not ruin your prospects in life.* And so if the events of this life,

every one of them arranged in the marvellous providence of God, are the very things which shape a man's character, and so determine his destiny for ever and ever, is it not manifestly cruel to persuade men to the contrary? Rather ought we to teach men to look with intense awe on the trials of life, to beware of the habits they contract, and the character which is gradually being impressed upon the soul. If a man spends his life in acts of self-seeking, or in acts of deceit or revenge, it is easy to see that he is contracting a character of soul which will totally unfit him for that kingdom of love where Christ shall reign with his saints.

And now let us glance at the Scriptural argument in favour of this new doctrine. The conception which the Primitive Church had of the future, and which, as we believe, it derived from the teaching of the Apostles, was the following. After the present life there is the intermediate state, where souls await the judgment in joyful or in awful anticipation; where, too, the saved are gradually perfected in the image of Christ, the 'good work' begun in this life being carried on to its completion, so that they may be presented perfect and blameless. Then follows the day of judgment, which is the closing act of the great drama now being enacted, and which has after it only the eternal bliss of heaven, or the eternal punishment of hell. Now the Restitutionists discard altogether this conception, and claim Scriptural grounds for the introduction of a new one. This new conception is what they term the 'doctrine of the ages.' They tell us that after this world there will be an indefinite number of 'ages' or periods, in which God will deal with lost sinners; that these ages extend far beyond the Day of Judgment; that during them God will subject the lost to ever severer trials, in proportion as they hold out, the judgment and the lake of fire being amongst the most severe; in fine, that the ages will only come to an end when all the lost are gathered in, and God is all in all.

Now we naturally inquire, what ground is there in Holy Scripture for thus upsetting the old Christian conception, and introducing the new one. The ground we find to be this. The sacred writers make use of certain phrases, which all scholars up to a recent period have understood to mean 'for ever' or 'everlasting.' These phrases are, *eis τὸν αἰῶνα*, literally 'for an age'; *eis τοὺς αἰῶνας*, 'for ages'; *eis τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, 'for ages of ages.' It is now contended that these are not merely differing modes of expressing the same idea of 'for ever,' but that they ought to be translated



literally. They really mean, so it is contended, exactly what they literally say, viz. not 'for ever,' but 'for an age,' 'for ages,' and 'for ages of ages.' It is to be observed that there is really no other ground for the 'doctrine of the ages,' but this literal translation of these phrases; because in no other way can we get at the fact that the Scripture contemplates 'ages' at all. It is sometimes said that if the adjective *aiōnios* can be made to mean anything less than everlasting, then that is enough for the doctrine; but *aiōnios* cannot possibly mean less than everlasting, except upon condition that the Scriptures contemplate a 'doctrine of the ages.' So that the whole controversy turns ultimately upon the question, whether these phrases are to be translated in the letter, and so to be taken as a 'doctrine of the ages.'

Well, now to consider this point.

The first thing to be remarked is, that supposing the inspired writers had really meant to express the idea of 'for ever,' they must have used phrases of a similar character, for phrases of another character did not exist, and could not possibly exist. No one who is at all acquainted with the processes of human thought which issue in the construction of language can for a moment doubt this. It is to be observed that primitive man does not sit down off-hand to work the differential calculus. On the contrary, a long and painful process is required before he can attain to such a height, or even get a glimpse of what it is like. He must first learn to count three upon his fingers, then five, and after that ten; and when he has laid this necessary foundation, he must then mount up slowly and painfully through arithmetic and other disciplines, till at length he attains to high mathematics. Similarly the human mind cannot by a single bound leap up to such difficult conceptions as eternal or lasting for ever. It is by a gradual process of enlargement that these and similar notions are attained. Men first seize upon some period of time, for instance, an age or lifetime; they put it in the plural, and then gradually enlarge the conception expressed by it, till at last they attain to the idea of 'for ever,' which is then fixed and embodied in some definite word or phrase. The process is clearly seen from expressions which are still current amongst us; we say, for instance, a thing would take ages to accomplish, or that it happened ages ago.

Hence all words denoting eternity or everlasting carry in their composition the history of their development. For instance, our word *eternal*, which is the Latin *aternus*, has exactly the same origin as the Greek *aiōnios*. It literally

means lasting an age, and we are bold to say that every argument which would tend to reduce *αἰῶνος* from *everlasting* is equally applicable to the word *eternal*. But, in the case of *eternal*, such an attempt would be hopeless. It was fixed in its present meaning, as we know from classical usage, long before the New Testament was written.

Now, if we bear these things in mind, we shall see that the inspired writers when they used the phrases, 'for an age,' 'for ages,' 'for ages of ages,' were not thinking of a 'doctrine of ages' at all, but were just using phrases which had long been fixed in the definite meaning which we attach to *everlasting*. Just in the same way, when we use the word 'always,' we are not thinking of 'roads' or 'ways,' but are simply expressing the relation in which something that we are thinking about stands to time in general. The proof of this assertion lies in the fact that there is not in the New Testament a single usage of any of these phrases where the meaning might not be for ever; and there are very many where it cannot possibly be anything else.

For instance, to take first the phrase *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. In Heb. vi. 20 and vii. 17, it is used to denote Christ's priesthood, which is for ever; and that nothing less than for ever will do here, is shown by the contrast which the Apostle draws between the priesthood of Christ and the Jewish priesthood. The Jewish priests were removed by death, but Christ is a priest for ever. Or, to take another example, Christ uses the same phrase to denote the duration of the life which He came into the world to bestow. In John vi. 51, Christ says, 'I am the living bread which cometh down from Heaven; if any man eat of this bread He shall live for ever.' It is clear that nothing less than 'for ever' will do here; for Christ could not possibly mean that the life which He came to bestow was to last for *one* out of the innumerable ages which Restitutionists speak of, and was then to come to an end. Or again, when S. Paul says, 2 Cor. ix. 9, that the righteousness of God remaineth for ever, can he possibly mean, that during the age which is now present, God is righteous, but possibly He may not continue to be righteous in the age which is coming? Or when Christ says to the fig-tree, 'let no fruit grow upon thee for ever,' does he mean it to be barren for the present age, and then to bear fruit in the following one?

Next comes the phrase, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, which is an intensified form of expressing exactly the same idea, and similarly we find that there are very many passages where it can only mean for ever. It is used by S. Paul in the following sentences, 'God, who is blessed for ever. Amen.' 'Christ,

who is over all, God, blessed for ever.' 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for ever more. Amen.' It is clear that the idea in the Apostle's mind in perusing these passages had no reference to 'ages' at all; he was simply expressing the idea of that adoration which is due and will be paid to God throughout eternity. But there is a passage in which the same phrase is used, which is put completely beyond cavil by the fact that a sentence put in apposition explains it. In Luke i. 33, we read of Christ: 'He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end.' And now we come to the most momentous expression of all, the *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, for this is the expression which is used to denote the endless duration of hell. In the Book of Revelation it is said of those, who are cast into the lake of fire, that they shall be tormented, or perhaps castigated for ever and ever. What does this mean? It is to be observed that even if we take it literally we do not sensibly diminish the idea. But plainly it is not to be taken literally. It is an intensified form of expressing the idea of neverendingness. This is clearly seen from other uses in the same book. Thus, for instance, it is said of Christ: 'I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen.' Similarly of the elect: 'They need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light, and they shall reign for ever and ever.'

In like manner, in regard to the adjective *αἰώνιος*, there can be no doubt that it means, and can mean nothing less than *everlasting*. This is clearly shown by Christ's use of the word in the phrase *eternal life*. What kind of a life would that have been which He came to bestow, if it had only been meant to last for an age, or even for all the ages? Surely we do not need His own repeated declaration, to be assured that they who possess that life shall never die, never perish; and it is in fact this attribute of imperishableness which the word *eternal* was meant to express. Or, when the same word is used of God, or of the Holy Spirit, how can it conceivably mean less than eternal? Or when S. Paul, speaking of the perishableness of our present body, comforts us by the assurance that we have a house eternal in the heavens, how can he possibly mean less than eternal?

Now if this be so, we see how completely the doctrine of the ages, and with it the Scriptural proof for the doctrine of Restitution, falls to the ground. If there is no doctrine of the ages, then the Day of Judgment reclaims the place which it has always held in the thoughts of Christians, namely, that of

being the last act of the great drama which is now being enacted. And the Day of Judgment tells us clearly that all are not restored ; at that day there is still a residuum left, and so they are sentenced to a doom which is unchangeable. 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment ; but the righteous into life eternal.'

And now we have done for the present. It is said that many of our younger clergy are adopting this opinion as being in their view more merciful, and less liable to objections. We would earnestly ask them, before taking such a course, to pause and consider. Is it really the case that this new doctrine is more merciful ? We think we have given reasons for believing that it is not so ; and then as to objections, it will be found, instead of diminishing them, to increase them tenfold. The moment we adopt it, we bring theology into conflict with the great fact of free-will ; it would be impossible for any length of time to hold the doctrine, and at the same time to recognise the fact of free-will. But what a state of things would this bring about ? How would it react even on the very premisses of Restitutionism ? It has hitherto been the glory of Catholic theology that it never has made a mistake in regard to the great problems of metaphysics. If we are led to adopt this new doctrine we shall make a mistake of the first magnitude ; and the consequences of this blunder would extend into every department of theology. Our whole doctrine of grace would need to be remodelled.

Then, too, there are immense practical issues dependent on the question. It is easy to see that this new doctrine, if adopted, would tend to destroy the estimate, which happily we now have, of the awful import of this life as that which determines our fate for ever. No, the true remedy for present difficulties is to be found, not in fanciful theories of the restoration of all, but in more rational views as to the state of the lost, and in bringing into greater prominence the doctrine of the intermediate state, which, unhappily, our traditional Calvinism denies. If it be so, that on opening the eyes in the intermediate state we open them upon the light, that then all darkness and all error are impossible, then surely no soul can be lost unless it has so lived, as that it chooses darkness rather than the light. If in that solemn moment it chooses the light, is drawn to the light, falls down in adoration before Him, who is the light, then however much it may have been stained, there is all the merciful discipline whereby it is chastened and perfected and made fit for the kingdom. If, on the other hand, it has so lived as to choose darkness rather

than the light, what is gained by supposing that God pursues it with unspeakable judgment, till He utterly crushes and breaks it down? It is not such forced service that our Master wants. He asks for the heart, and nothing less than the heart will satisfy Him.

### ART. III.—GOVERNMENT OF CHARLES I.

1. *A History of England under the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I.*, 1624–28. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER.
2. *The Personal Government of Charles I.* A History of England from the Assassination of the Duke of Buckingham to the Declaration of the Judges on Ship-money, 1628–37. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER.<sup>1</sup>

IT was hardly necessary for Mr. Gardiner to apologise for applying himself to the investigation of the history of what he truly calls 'a momentous period,' after 'the many great writers who have given their thoughts to the world on the subject of these years' (*Pref.* vi.); for certainly the history of one's own country is one of the noblest subjects that can employ the industry of a scholar. And, copiously as the reign of Charles I. has been discussed, both as a whole, and also with respect to separate transactions or periods, it is in the very sense which previous writers have entertained of its enduring importance, that Mr. Gardiner finds the strongest motive, or, as he would characterise it, excuse for adding himself to the number. He abstains from mentioning names, but it seems to him that they have all taken as personal an interest, as it were, in all the details of the struggle between Charles and his Parliament, as is usually inspired by contemporary events; and that, consequently, they have not attained, nor even aimed at that impartiality which is commonly recognised as one of the first duties of an historian; that some have written as Whigs, others as Tories; that the 'one class has thought it unnecessary to take the trouble to understand how matters looked in the eyes of the King and of his friends; the other class has thought it unnecessary to take the trouble to understand how

<sup>1</sup> In referring to these two works, it will be more convenient to treat them as one, and to speak of this last as vols. iii. and iv.

matters looked in the eyes of the leaders of the House of Commons'—(*ib.* vii.). There was, therefore, he conceived, still room for a writer who would make it his object honestly to represent the transactions of this important and still exciting epoch under both these aspects; so as to 'do justice to the motives of both parties' in the strife, 'without misrepresenting either.' Where, as too often happens, no attempt whatever is made to 'understand the strong points of the King's case, or the weak points in the case of his opponents, the result,' he truly says, 'is a mere caricature.' Undoubtedly, this is the spirit in which history should be written: and it is but justice to Mr. Gardiner to admit that he has carried out the views which he has thus expressed with rare fidelity and candour. We can see, indeed, that his sympathies are with Eliot, Pym, and Hampden; but they have not prevented him from doing full justice to the benevolent intentions which actuated Charles, even amid his most dangerous encroachments on the liberties of his subjects; nor to the statesmanlike grandeur of Wentworth, displayed, not in barren goodwill, but in substantial and enduring benefits to the people entrusted to his government. If ever Hallam forgot his candour, it was in his denunciation of what he termed Wentworth's 'fatal and base apostasy from the path of true honour,' which he attributed to the lowest motives of jealousy and self-interest. Even Hume, while amply displaying and acknowledging his brilliant talents and great services, abstains from justifying him wholly from the accusation. But Mr. Gardiner has shown conclusively that no charge was ever dictated by a more complete misapprehension of his character and entire career; that, far from ever quitting the path in which he first walked, he was consistent and unchanged throughout his whole public life: and that the very same principles which, during the first years of Charles, led him to resist the encroachments of the King, and to frame and advocate with irresistible eloquence the Petition of Right, influenced him equally in his subsequent opposition to the majority of the House of Commons, when proceedings seemed to him to tend to its disorder and anarchy—(*ii.* 321.)

Indeed, so great is Mr. Gardiner's desire to do justice to every political leader of the age with which he deals, that he throws his shield even over Buckingham, and attributes to him a disinterested patriotism and a steadiness of political view for which certainly none of his contemporaries gave him credit, and of which we confess that even our historian's earnest advocacy of his honesty has failed to convince us. Mr. Gardiner's view of the Duke is to some extent shown by



the rather curious title which he has prefixed to his first two volumes: 'England under the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I.,' as if he had been not so much the most influential favourite and counsellor of the Sovereign, as the real and ostensible governor of the State. He admits, indeed, that both as politician and general he lacked ability; but he maintains that, 'if the politician was at fault, the man was not' (ii. 165), and is not afraid to compare the expedition to Rhé, and the position of the English force under the Duke's command, to 'that of the allied armies before Sebastopol after the failure of the first bombardment;' or to argue that the difference in the final results of the two enterprises may be traced to the fact that Lord Raglan had 'a powerful government behind him, and a nation feverishly anxious for the honour of its arms;' supports which, had they been supplied to Buckingham, might possibly have enabled him to defeat the stratagems of the warlike Cardinal.

Still, if ever a departure from absolute impartiality be excusable, it is in the estimate of the character of public men, who are fairly entitled to have the most favourable construction, consistent with probability, placed upon their actions, from the greatness of the difficulties and trials to which, even in the most peaceful and easy-going times, they are exposed beyond their contemporaries, and that in a degree which the student in his closet can hardly appreciate. When events, not persons, are under discussion, Mr. Gardiner seems eminently dispassionate and judicious. And there is no period in our annals in which the exercise of such qualities is more important; hardly one, too, in which it is more difficult.

In all fairness, it must be admitted that, even in those instances in which Charles's infractions of the legal rights and liberties of his subjects were most undeniable, he was not wholly without plausible excuse. It was true, indeed, that Magna Charta, with its score of confirmations, had secured, as far as enactments could secure, every individual in his personal freedom, and in the possession of his property, to be diminished only by such imposts as he himself, by his representatives, had consented to. But it was equally true that throughout the sixteenth century those great statutes had been so constantly violated by a succession of arbitrary monarchs, that they seemed to have become almost a dead letter. Those 'iron barons' who had withstood the great Edward in the fulness of his power; who, by the deposition of Richard II., had established the principle of a contract between the king and the people; and who by their exertions

in another direction had nearly brought France into subjection, had been swept away by the fatal War of the Roses; and during the reigns of the five Tudor sovereigns the will of the sovereign had been obeyed by the Parliament with almost uninterrupted submission. Even Hallam, who with patriotic diligence and satisfaction enumerates every instance of the resistance of the Commons, is compelled to own that the 'dominion over Parliament' exercised by Henry VIII. was 'almost absolute;' that Mary imposed taxes without procuring the assent of, or even consulting either House; that the records of the whole period are full of instances of illegal imprisonments, and even of illegal executions; and that, while even under the more constitutional sway of the later Plantagenets, 'the excesses of prerogative had never been thoroughly restrained,' there 'had evidently been a retrograde tendency towards absolute monarchy from the occupation of the throne by Edward IV.' In a country, therefore, where law has at all times been so greatly interpreted and regulated by precedent as in England, it cannot be thought unintelligible, nor at first sight wholly unpardonable, that a prince like Charles should have adopted the reasoning which Hume puts into the mouth of the partisans of the Court, that 'the principle for which lawyers contend, that a statute can never be abrogated by opposite custom is vain,' and that, on the contrary, 'if a statute has at any time been rashly voted and assented to, it cannot be more effectually abrogated than by a train of contrary precedents, which prove that by common consent it has tacitly been set aside as inconvenient and impracticable.' The mistake of Charles was that he overlooked the degree in which the weak reign of his father had shaken the prerogative which his predecessors had built up, a result to which his own encouragement of the impeachment of Lord Middlesex had also contributed. But he seems to have thought absolute power so inalienably the sovereign's right, that to be re-established, it needed only to be re-asserted, instead of regarding it as an artificial dam by which the natural stream of liberty might indeed be kept back for a time; but which was in itself so unnatural that the slightest breach in it once made would ruin the whole superstructure.

But we shall not do justice to Charles, nor form a correct estimate of his actions during the first portion of his reign, which is the subject of the works before us, unless we constantly bear in mind the ends for which he sought to exercise the uncontrolled authority which he claimed. Undoubtedly he did not wholly overlook the consideration of his own

dignity; but it is equally certain, and is fully admitted by Mr. Gardiner, that his principal object was the welfare and happiness of his people, to be secured by the encouragement of virtue and the maintenance of justice. His view of good government and of national prosperity (for the two were never separated in his mind) was, as it was tersely expressed by a statesman of a later age and a different country, 'Everything for the people; but nothing by them;'—or, as Mr. Gardiner describes his opinions, 'he knew better what was good for the people than they could possibly know for themselves.' He would have had his subjects feel towards him as Juvenal bade the Romans feel towards Jupiter—

'Permittes ipsis expendere numinibus, quid  
Conveniat nobis, rebusque sit utile nostris,  
Nam pro jucundis aptissima quæque dabunt Di.'

In elucidating the history of this period, Mr. Gardiner gives more prominence than any other recent writer, except Ranke, to the negotiations with foreign Powers, never long interrupted, and most of them connected more or less directly with the affairs of the Palatinate, and in which it is evident that Charles's personal affection for his sister and her children was deeply concerned. They were not unknown to Hume and Carte, but of late they had been so completely lost sight of that Macaulay asserts that after the dissolution of 1629 'Charles hastened to make peace with his neighbours, and thenceforth gave his whole mind to British politics.'<sup>1</sup> But diligent researches, not only among 'the foreign series of State papers in our own Record Office,' but among the French despatches which are preserved in the Museum Library, and other public documents in the archives of Vienna and Brussels, to which he has obtained access, have enabled Mr. Gardiner to show the utter groundlessness of such an assertion, since in fact there was no single year in which Charles was not conducting either open or secret negotiations with every court on the Continent, with Sweden, Spain, the Empire, France, and the States of Holland. And he proves at the same time that the hopes and projects founded on those negotiations had an immediate and powerful influence on the King's domestic policy.

The apology, therefore, with which he seeks to pacify 'those of his readers who may think that he has allotted too large a space to the treatment of foreign affairs,' is certainly not necessary, especially as the importance which he attaches

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, i. 85 (10th ed. 1854).

to them has in no degree blinded him to the still greater interest of the internal affairs of the kingdom. On the contrary, if he boasts, as he is well entitled to boast, of having succeeded in disentangling the complicated labours of diplomacy during the years of which he speaks, he can with equal truth affirm that he has brought to light a vast 'wealth of new material relating to the Parliamentary contests' of the first four years of the reign; and that he himself has been the first person to discover a valuable report of the great Session of 1628 (*Harl. MSS.* 4771), 'which, strangely enough, lurked unknown in that well-ransacked collection, till he was fortunate enough to light upon it, by which the history of the struggle which led to the Petition of Right is at last made clear, the part taken by the various leaders becomes more intelligible, and Wentworth's character especially receives fresh elucidation; and we come to understand, when the evidence is sifted, how he came to take service under the King without being an apostate'—(i. v.). Other documents, which Mr. Gardiner is the first person to have consulted, have enabled him to unfold 'the details of the way in which the Peers dealt with Buckingham's impeachment, and with the still more important questions arising out of the Petition of Right.' 'Writers,' to quote his own description, 'have hitherto been content to guess what passed in the House of Lords, and have frequently guessed wrong. Especially is this the case with respect to Bishop Williams, who turns out to have had nothing to do with the additional clause reserving sovereignty to the Crown, which is usually attributed to him, and to have been totally innocent of those intrigues against the Petition which have called forth such denunciations of his conduct.' Even Hallam, with all his diligence and candour, has adopted the story, and has founded on it, and on the Bishop's imagined subserviency to Buckingham, charges of 'corruption, baseness, and treachery,' sufficient, as it seems to him, to justify the distrust of both the House of Peers and the King, shewn by the Commons in all their proceedings as to the Petition.<sup>1</sup>

Thus to throw additional light on the transactions of so important a time, and at the same time to clear the character of those who took a leading part in those transactions, is a service not only to historical truth but to a correct appreciation of mankind in general. Lord Melbourne on one occasion said that familiarity with public affairs, and experience in dealing with public men of different parties and countries,

<sup>1</sup> *Constitutional History*, i. 532, note (3rd ed. 1832).

had convinced him that such men commonly acted from much purer motives than were commonly attributed to them. We most cordially agree in the truth of this observation, and are satisfied that the frame of mind which it inculcates is that which is most desirable, not only for the statesman whose career may be under review, but also for the student of history who is examining his conduct, since hardly any habit can have a more deteriorating influence on one's own character than that of seeking for unworthy motives. Statesmanship and the government of nations commonly present only alternatives of difficulties, between which the ablest and the most honest men may well hesitate. And never was this more the case than in the 17th century, and nowhere at that time more than in England, where the Constitution, however apparently defined by a series of carefully-framed enactments, was practically still in a state of transition, and where the considerations of questions of civil policy was complicated by the intrusion of others relating to religion, and by the contest, not merely between the old Roman Catholic and the new Protestant forms, but between the different schools of Protestantism, the rivalry between which was scarcely less keen and bitter than that which separated either from Popery.

The first half of the reign of Charles I. Mr. Gardiner divides into two periods. The first, that during which, in his view, the King was so completely under Buckingham's influence, that the Duke was, in fact, the ruler of the nation. The second, that in which, after the Duke's death, 'Charles stepped at once into the supreme direction of affairs'—(iii. 2). In the first, Buckingham's influence was not the least of his royal master's difficulties, so general, and, it must be admitted, so well founded was the jealousy with which he was regarded in both Houses of Parliament. We need not enlarge here on the greatness of the offence committed by Charles during the second of these periods in dispensing altogether with the Parliament; but it is a remarkable fact that he was so far from being originally unfavourable to Parliaments, that his first idea, after his accession, was, for the avoidance of delay, to continue the last Parliament of his father's reign, till he was warned by Bishop Williams that such a step would be a violation of the Constitution, according to which the decease of the sovereign dissolved the existing House of Commons, and rendered a fresh election requisite. For this he at once issued writs, summoning the House to meet within three months of the day of his accession. And we see an

evidence of the anxiety with which the whole nation expected the announcement of the policy of the new reign in two circumstances mentioned by our historian, that 'never within living memory had there been such competition for seats in the House of Commons. Never had the members chosen attended so numerous on the first day of the Session'—(i. 189). Not that the objects for which the Government was solicitous were the same which produced this excitement among the people. Buckingham was engrossed by schemes of foreign policy. Full of animosity against the Court of Madrid, he was eager for an offensive and defensive alliance with France and the United States of Holland; and, had his will prevailed, he would once more have embarked England in a war for the acquisition of Continental dominion. He made no doubt that such a confederacy would easily wrest the Netherlands from Philip; and, though the Dutch Republic must be the chief gainer by such a conquest, he proposed that France should be rewarded by the important province of Artois, and the strength it would add to her position, while England should be reimbursed by the still more valuable district between Brussels and Ostend; and he urged that the loss of the whole province must disable Spain from ever again becoming formidable in the north of Europe.

But the Parliament had no inclination for war, and was not more disposed to an alliance with France. In the week before it met, the young Queen, the daughter of Henry IV., had arrived in England; and already a general and deep discontent had been aroused by the indulgences in the matter of religion which had been granted to her attendants; though for them it was evident that it was not Charles, but his father who was responsible. The feeling which existed on the subject was shown in the very first debate of the Commons. The King, in his opening speech, had dwelt chiefly on the diplomatic engagements which, by the advice of his Parliament, James had incurred in the early part of the year; and touched in only the most cursory manner on his resolution 'to maintain true religion.' But the Commons scarcely heeded his mention of existing treaties with foreign Powers; and declared religion the first thing to be considered. 'Their duty to God,' said Sir Francis Seymour, 'must not be forgotten. Let them ask the King to put in execution the laws against priests and Jesuits'—(i. 194). And, after Sir John Eliot and Pym had enlarged on this topic with uncompromising earnestness (Eliot's adoption of this line of argument being, in Mr. Gardiner's view, the more remarkable because he himself was



free from Puritan ideas), a formal petition was drawn up entreating the King 'to execute the penal laws in all their strictness, and to take other measures to prevent the spread of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church.'

And this movement, in itself sufficiently distasteful to the King, was rendered more unpalatable still by the positive refusal of the Commons to grant more than a mere fraction of the sums which were needed for the prosecution of the warlike measures to which he was bound, partly by his own, and still more by his father's promises. The estimate for the war expenses of the coming year alone amounted to a million of money. But the sum voted by the Commons was only 200,000*l.*, and even that doubled what had been proposed by some members. This niggardliness has been generally condemned as unbecoming and impolitic. But, in Mr. Gardiner's opinion, it was very greatly to be attributed to the mismanagement of the Government itself. As he truly remarks, 'Above all things assemblies of men ask to be led, and to this assembly no guidance was offered.' 'Not a Minister rose in his place to say how much was wanted, or to explain in what way the surplus voted would be spent.' The Lord Keeper, Bishop Williams, did indeed announce to the two Houses that 'supply was urgently needed,' but he named no sum. 'And silence such as this, whether it was the result of a deliberate purpose, or, as is more likely, of mere youthful inexperience and ignorance of human nature, was in itself the worst of policies'—(i. 192).

Not that, while saying this, Mr. Gardiner entirely acquits the House itself: regarding the vote as practically one of want of confidence in the King's advisers, he nevertheless 'regrets the manner in which the thing was done.' He admits that 'the Court party had been taken by surprise,' and that the leaders of the Opposition gave no sufficient reasons for the step thus taken, so as to 'conciliate popular feeling.' The truth is, however, probably, that those leaders were too much divided in their views to agree upon any such statement. In his mention of a motion made by Sir Thomas Mallory that, on account of the plague which was raging with great violence in London, the King should be requested

<sup>1</sup> Grants at this time were divided into subsidies and fifteenths—a subsidy was a tax on landed property, and for many generations had been constantly falling in value. As late as the time of Elizabeth one had produced 120,000*l.* It now only produced 70,000*l.* A fifteenth was a tax on personal property or moveables, as it was usually called, levied according to a valuation of Edward III., and was uniform in the amount it produced, 30,000*l.*

to adjourn the Session till Michaelmas, Mr. Gardiner tells us that it was 'warmly supported by Sir Thomas Wentworth,' who had lately begun to take a prominent part in politics, and that his motive was an objection to any Continental war. 'The duty of England, he considered, was to attend to its own business, to amend its laws, and improve the administration of justice, leaving the Continent to settle its troubles in its own way'—(i. 193). But there is no doubt that many members, and a large majority of the nation, would gladly have embarked in war for the re-establishment of the Palatine in his dominions, an object equally dear to their religious and political feelings; and we believe that the chief bond of union between the different sections of the Opposition was one which as yet no one liked to allege as a ground of action, distrust and jealousy of Buckingham. Even on this point the two great orators of the party were not fully agreed; for Sir John Eliot had not wholly shaken off the recollection of some personal obligations under which the Duke had laid him, while Wentworth's feeling was that of contempt for his incapacity, mingled with no small distrust of his motives.

Nor was this the only matter in which these two illustrious and excellent men were divided; for, though often uniting in the pursuit of a common end, their principles were widely different, and a right understanding of their characters is so important, that we will quote Mr. Gardiner's description of them:—

'With Wentworth good government was the sole object in view. Everything else was mere machinery. Conscious of his own powers, he was longing for an opportunity of exercising them for the good of his fellow-countrymen. But, excepting so far as they could serve his ends, he cared nothing for those constitutional forms which counted for so much in the eyes of other men. . . . He was an outspoken representative of that large class of politicians who hold that ability is the chief requisite for government, and who look with ill-concealed contempt upon that view which bases government upon the popular will.

'Eliot stood at the opposite pole of political thought. He was to the bottom of his heart an idealist. To him the Parliament was scarcely a collection of fallible beings; just as the King was hardly a being who could by any possibility go deliberately astray. If he who wore the crown wandered from the right path, he had but to listen to those who formed in more than a rhetorical sense the collective wisdom of the nation. Whoever stepped between King and people; whoever tendered other counsel than the House of Commons had to offer, was a divider and a traitor'—(i. 16).

The sparing grant of two subsidies was not, however, the

only financial arrangement which, as the King conceived, gave him reason to complain of the Commons. Another source of revenue was the impost on exports and imports, known as tonnage and poundage. As long ago as the days of the Plantagenets it had been the custom of Parliament, in the first session of the reign, to grant this impost to the sovereign for his life; and the grant had been regarded so completely as a matter of course that the revenue officers had, in more than one instance, collected the duty before Parliament could meet to vote it. But the present House of Commons was not in a humour to be bound by precedents. They had chosen to erect themselves into a theological tribunal; and in that character to visit a clergyman named Montague with their severest condemnation. In the last year of the preceding reign, Montague had written a pamphlet in reply to another put forth by a Roman Catholic priest, which, in Mr. Gardiner's opinion, 'an impartial judgment will probably consider a temperate exposition of the reasons which were leading an increasing body of scholars to reject the doctrines of Rome and of Geneva alike'—(i. 206). But 'he refused to speak of the Roman Church as indubitably Antichrist, or of the Pope as the Man of Sin,' and he had described the adherents of Geneva doctrine as Puritans—a term which was then looked upon as a disgraceful epithet, only applicable to those who refused conformity to the Prayer-Book—(ib. 218). Two clergymen, who felt aggrieved by having such a title fixed upon them, complained of it to the House of Commons. The House referred the consideration of the matter to Archbishop Abbot, who, though himself favourable to Calvinism, apparently saw no ground for censuring Montague's views. And before any formal sentence was pronounced, Montague had found that James himself was inclined to sympathise with his doctrine; so that with his approval he prepared a second treatise, under the title of *Appello Casarem*, reiterating with greater emphasis the tenets advanced in the former. But as James died before it was completed, Charles allowed it to be published with a dedication to himself.

Though the new House of Commons was not that which had requested Abbot to examine the first treatise, it chose to pronounce that the authority of Parliament had been slighted by Montague's publication of this second work while his first was under consideration, and passed a series of resolutions on the subject, which Mr. Gardiner rightly characterises as 'absolutely ludicrous;' and committed the writer to custody for what was alleged to be contempt of the House.

Charles, however, agreed with his father in regarding him and his writings with approval, and showed his feeling by nominating Montague one of his chaplains. The Commons were offended and alarmed. In their narrow bigotry they had no idea of permitting even the King to approve of views from which they differed. They fancied, too, that they saw in the act of thus taking the offender into the royal service, the advancement of a claim to deny the responsibility of the King's servants to any one but their master. The resolution to which they came on the question of Tonnage and Poundage was doubtless meant as an answer to this pretension. They brought in and passed a Bill to grant the impost for a single year; and even that was not finally carried. For the plague increased in virulence so greatly, that before the Bill could pass the Lords, the Session was adjourned, to meet at Oxford at the end of three weeks.

Mr. Gardiner's comment on the state of affairs is that 'Religion was to be Charles's main difficulty in the future. His main difficulty in the present was want of money'—(i. 221). We should rather say that religion had already become his main difficulty, and that a reason, at least as powerful as any other, for the want of generosity in money matters shown by the Commons, was to be found in their resolution to force on the Government their own theological views, with respect not only to Roman Catholics, but to the different schools of Protestantism. The resolution was shown more strongly than ever on the very first day after the Parliament re-assembled at Oxford. June and July had been eventful months. Admiral Pennington, with a fleet of eight ships, had been despatched to France and placed at the service of the French king. But when he reached Dieppe, he learnt that the object for which his aid was required was an attack on Rochelle, which the Huguenots were gallantly defending against Richelieu; and, as there was not an English sailor in the whole fleet who was willing to co-operate in the subjugation of his brother Protestants, he took on himself the responsibility of returning to Portsmouth. The Government, or rather Buckingham, was in great perplexity; and the Duke's only expedient to extricate himself was to try and deceive every one who was concerned in the transaction. Of the eight ships, only one, the 'Vanguard,' belonged to the navy; the rest were merchantmen, which had been hired for that particular service. And by availing himself of this mixed character of the squadron he hoped to be able to cheat the French and the House of Commons. He sent orders to Pennington to return to Dieppe, and to deliver up the ships to the

French. He ordered Nicholas, his secretary, to do his best 'to hinder, or at least to delay their delivery.' He tampered with the owners of the merchant vessels to induce them to refuse to allow their ships to be employed on such a service. And he even sent 'underhand instructions to Pennington to encourage the crew of the "Vanguard" herself to mutiny'—(i. 247). Before July ended, news arrived that the Huguenots had made their peace with Louis; on which he once more sent orders to Pennington to return to Dieppe, believing that France was on the point of declaring war against Spain; and that the employment of the ships against that hated nation would propitiate the Opposition, and prevent all inquiry into their original destination.

But when the Parliament re-assembled at Oxford it was from the first seen that the Commons were in no mood to put a favourable interpretation on any act of the Government. They did indeed, on the first day of their meeting, appoint a finance committee, though even in doing that their intention was not so much to increase their hitherto scanty supplies, as to inquire into the past expenditure, and into the proceedings of the farmers of the revenue, who had been busy in the collection of the Tonnage and Poundage, though the Bill to authorise its levy had not passed. But, practically, they postponed even the question of finance to that of religion. As Mr. Gardiner puts it, 'the first day was devoted to the Catholics; the second to the High Churchmen.' First, they complained that pardons had been granted to some Jesuits; and next, that Montague was still unpunished, though they had declared him guilty of 'contempt;' Sir Edward Coke himself, the greatest legal authority in the kingdom, not being ashamed to say that 'no books concerning religion ought to be printed without the sanction of Convocation.' Mr. Gardiner justly holds up the intolerance of the House to reprobation, though pointing out that the Government was equally blind. 'On liberty, so far as it implied the right of each man to enjoy freedom of person and property according to the law of the land, Coke (and Eliot) placed the highest value. For liberty, so far as it meant intellectual liberty, they cared nothing at all.' Had Charles's mind been of a higher order he might have entered the lists against the legal intolerance of Coke, and the dogmatic intolerance of the Calvinistic clergy, with a fair prospect of success. If he had failed, at least he would have failed in 'a noble cause'—(i. 260). But in fact, 'neither he nor Buckingham cared really for the principle of religious toleration. They were both of them ready to execute the

penal laws against the Catholics if it could be done without risk to the French alliance'—(*ib.* 281).

It was not strange, therefore, that Charles sought to evade the question as to the Roman Catholics, while with respect to Montague, he had still more pressing motives for the same line of conduct, since the attack which the Commons made upon him was an attack also on the principle that persons in the King's service were protected by their offices: a principle for which, though, in the case of Middlesex in his father's time, he had himself disregarded it, he was now resolved to contend to the uttermost. He, therefore, took no further notice of the remonstrance of the House on these transactions than to promise that it should receive a speedy answer. But at the same time, with what must be confessed to have been an unstatesmanlike ignorance of, or indifference to their feelings on the subject, he thought it still possible to induce the Commons to grant him a further supply. On the fourth day of the Session he summoned the members to Christchurch Hall for the purpose, making them a short speech himself as a sort of introduction to the statements to be made by some of his Ministers. But again he committed the same fault which Mr. Gardiner, as we have seen, condemns in his opening of the former Session. Neither he nor his Ministers explained his views fully and frankly; nay, they even managed or mismanaged so strangely that they did not all agree together either in the sums which they mentioned as necessary, nor in the objects for which the money was required. Charles himself 'dwelt entirely on the fleet.' Sir Edward Conway, as a member of the Council of War, 'took a wider view of the situation. He said that 30,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* were wanted to enable the fleet to start; but he drew a picture in the background of the Continent in flames, and hinted at the large sums needed for keeping the Protestant forces on foot in Germany and the Netherlands.' Sir John Coke did not confine himself to hints. 'With all possible emphasis he enlarged upon the greatness of the work before them. 600,000*l.* would be wanted for Mansfield and the King of Denmark. He argued that, though Mansfield's armament had not been so successful as could have been wished, it had shown that the King of England was in earnest. The German princes had been encouraged. The Danes had taken the field. The King of France was aiming at Milan, and had made peace with his Huguenot subjects. It now devolved upon Parliament to consider whether they would yield his Majesty a convenient help'—(*i.* 265-7). Yet, even he 'left his hearers in uncertainty'



—how much the Government really expected—‘an uncertainty which was doubtless shared by the King. . . . The success of the fleet might perhaps enable him to dispense with’ much that Coke had mentioned. And so ‘he did not come forward with a definite demand which he himself recognised as indispensable. He tried to influence the minds of the members without first making up his own’—(*ib.*).

But *omne ignotum pro magnifico* is not more true of anything than of demands for money. The manifest uncertainty of the Government communicated itself to the House. The sum mentioned by Coke seemed in that age enormous, and was certainly unexampled. Not even when the Armada was preparing at Lisbon, and Parma with his legions was arrayed on the Flemish coast, had Elizabeth made such demands on her subjects. Yet, should the fleet fail instead of succeeding, there was no security that even this prodigious grant would prove sufficient. No wonder that in such a state of things members were found to argue that, when it was possible that all that could be granted might prove inadequate, it was as well to hold their hands altogether. Sir Francis Seymour attacked the whole foreign policy of the Government, avowing openly ‘that he had no confidence in the advisers of the Crown. They had given three subsidies and three fifteenths for the Queen of Bohemia. And she was nothing the better. Nothing had been done. They knew not their enemy. They had set upon and consumed their own people. What he wished for was that they might now do somewhat for the country. And they would then give his Majesty a seasonable and bountiful supply.’

He was evidently speaking the sense of a large portion of the Opposition. They desired to confine the expenditure of the nation to the domestic uses of the nation. They would, indeed, have grudged nothing to re-establish their Princess and her husband in his dominions, but they ‘distrusted Buckingham’s capacity, perhaps his integrity,’ and saw no prospect of any grant being judiciously employed while he had the regulation of the expenditure. Other members went further, and attacked even the management of affairs at home. Sir Robert Philips complained that the farmers of the revenue had collected Tonnage and Poundage though it had not yet been granted by Parliament, and, warming with his own energy, went on to question ‘prerogative,’ and to remind the House ‘that their forefathers had struggled against it.’ One sentence of his speech, read by the light of subsequent events, was but too prophetic. ‘When kings are

persuaded to do what they should not, subjects have often been persuaded to do what they ought not.' But at the moment such words were calculated rather to irritate Charles than to warn him, the more so as the speaker concluded with a somewhat odd jumble of intolerance, conciliatory submission, and eagerness for constitutional reform. 'The best way to secure ourselves is to suppress the Papists here. Let the fleet go in. Let us not part till his Majesty may see an ample demonstration of our affections. Let us look into the estate and government, and, finding that which is amiss, make this Parliament the reformer of the commonwealth' (i. 272-3).

'Such a speech was an historical event.' It was in vain that Heath, the Solicitor-General, tried to neutralise its effect by suggestions of the King's willingness to gratify the House in all reasonable desires. More than one speaker openly recommended the calling the Duke to account, till at last Buckingham himself became alarmed, for surely it could have been only the extremest perplexity of apprehension that could have suggested the idea that the King could altogether break the engagement to protect the Roman Catholics, into which he had entered with Louis on the occasion of his marriage, and that in fact Louis himself was indifferent to its performance, having only required the stipulation to deceive the Pope—(i. 281). It was still more in vain that with this strange notion in his head the Duke undertook to harangue the Commons himself, professing, indeed, to explain in detail the objects for which the King required money, but practically aiming at inducing them to vote the supply, and to leave him to spend it. Mr. Gardiner acquits him of intending to deceive the House. 'But it is one thing to hold that he was sincere, it is another thing to hold that what he said ought to have given satisfaction. . . . His explanation, taken at its best, is fatal to his claims to statesmanship'—(i. 285-7), and, far from removing their distrust of him, it even irritated some by 'his assumption of almost regal dignity in the tone in which he specified his expectations.' Mr. Forster, in his *Life of Eliot*, gives a long and powerful speech on the subject, which he found among Sir John's papers, but Mr. Gardiner proves that, though such a speech had indeed been prepared, it was never spoken. Other members, however, spoke with great effect—Seymour, Philips, and, above all, Wentworth. He was never illiberal, but as a champion of the rights of the House, he had taken great offence at a threat implied in the Duke's harangue, that if they did not give they should be

dissolved. 'He was not,' he said, 'against giving, but against the manner' (i. 291), and, before any decision was come to, intelligence arrived of English vessels having been plundered by pirates in the Channel itself. Even our coast had become so unsafe, 'that vessels scarcely ventured from port to port. . . . It was known that orders given by the Council for the employment of some of the King's ships against the pirates had been countermanded by the Navy Commissioners' (i. 293). The Opposition, and, secretly, we must believe, many even of the supporters of the Government, were excited by patriotic indignation, and under this intolerable shame, Buckingham was openly named as the Minister to whom, or to whose agents, it was to be imputed.

The denunciation of one who was not only his Minister, but his friend, was regarded by Charles as a direct challenge. It was to no purpose that Sir Henry Martin, a member of weight with a considerable section of the House, still proposed to grant a supply. Charles saw that 'his own authority was at stake. The course which the Commons were taking led surely, if indirectly, to the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament. And the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament meant just as surely the transference of sovereignty from the Crown to the Parliament'—(i. 295). He determined to dissolve the Parliament. It was to no purpose that the sagacious Lord Keeper 'pleaded hard against the fatal error of opening the new reign with a quarrel with the House of Commons;' and that the Duke himself took the same side, in mere hypocrisy, as was commonly believed; though, in Mr. Gardiner's opinion, he was expressing his real sentiments and wishes, since 'it was not in his nature to shrink from opposition.' But Charles was immovable. When the House met on the 12th, it was known that it would be allowed to exist but for a few minutes longer. In these, its last moments, some members, unwilling to let the brief space remaining to them pass without one more effort to bring the House into harmony with its sovereign, endeavoured to obtain a hearing for a proposal of supply. But Wentworth put all such schemes aside in a few haughty words, 'We are under the rod, and cannot with credit or safety yield. Since we sat here the subjects have lost a subsidy at sea.' It was resolved, however, so far to show a desire to propitiate his Majesty as to vote an address 'solemnly protesting and vowing before God and the world, with one heart and one voice, that they would ever continue his most loyal and obedient subjects . . . that they would always be ready to afford all necessary

supply to his Majesty, upon his present and all other his just occasions and designs; most humbly beseeching him' (whom they styled 'their most ever dear and dread sovereign'), 'in his princely wisdom and goodness, to rest assured of the true and hearty affection of his poor Commons, and to esteem the same, as they indeed conceived it to be the greatest worldly reputation and security a just king can have'—(i. 297). But Charles was not to be moved by dutiful expressions, sincere though they undoubtedly were, of obedience and affection to himself, so long as Buckingham was regarded with different feelings. And so the Parliament was dissolved only twelve days after it had re-assembled; and before it had had time to make any further grant of supply, or to carry a single measure of any kind.

It is impossible for the King's warmest advocates to deny that the dissolution was not only a most unfortunate, but a most ill-judged act. It was placing the Crown and the Parliament at the outset of the reign in a position of antagonism; embarking both in a contest for power to which there could hardly be but one issue. Mr. Gardiner, however, is not inclined to acquit the Commons of some want both of judgment and of fairness. He will 'not defend all that was said, still less all that was thought in the House about Buckingham.' And he regards 'the speeches of the popular members as full of unfounded suspicions and unreasonable demands'—(i. 298). The censure, which he practically qualifies by more than one candid admission of the mischief the Duke had done, is apparently due in no slight degree to the ignorance of foreign affairs which he attributes to the Parliament. 'Their conception of the war was more suited to 1588 than to 1625; and the maze of European politics formed for them a labyrinth without a thread. In all they had to say about the affairs of the Continent it is hard to find a single word which betrays any real knowledge of the wants and difficulties of the Protestants of Germany.' The charge is no doubt well founded; but the state of mind which it denounces is not peculiar to that Parliament nor to that age. The occasions have been very rare when the interest in foreign politics has not been confined to a very small portion of the people, while an accurate and judicious comprehension of them is even still more limited. But, in fact, the discontent with the Duke was equally justified by the internal or domestic policy of the Court, especially in its financial transactions; the one point in which it was blameless being, perhaps, that for which the Commons were least likely to see any justification. The

Court would not persecute the Roman Catholics, and still less the moderate High Churchmen ; while, if the Commons could only get their way, 'differences of opinion' (in religious matters) 'were to be altogether prohibited, and the Calvinistic creed was to be imposed for ever on the English nation'—(i. 301). Whatever share these different motives may have had in producing the result, it was a most unfortunate one for the nation. There is no time in which first impressions, proverbially important, can be half so important as at the beginning of a new reign. And in this instance the end of the proceedings of Charles's first Parliament, though it only sat exactly five weeks,<sup>1</sup> had been, instead of laying a foundation of harmony between the King and the Houses, to place them in a position of antagonism. Unless the breach thus made could be speedily closed—a work not to be accomplished without consummate prudence on both sides—there was reason to fear that it would widen till either the rightful authority of the King or the liberties of the people would be swallowed up in it.

Unhappily every transaction on the Continent made matters worse instead of better. The Parliament had hardly separated when news arrived that the treaty which had been said to have been made between the French King and his Huguenot subjects had either never been ratified, or had been grossly violated. 'The English ships were in the hands of the French Admiral, and would doubtless be used against the citizens of Rochelle'—(i. 303). Charles, who by his premature dissolution of the Parliament, had lost the further supply which it might have voted, began to issue Privy Seals, as orders of the Privy Council were termed, for the raising of a forced loan, which no law that had ever been enacted could warrant. It seemed as if the more Charles was in want of money, the more determined was he on schemes which could not be prosecuted without money. He had brought himself to believe that a confederacy against Spain was the most effectual means of restoring his brother-in-law to his dominions ; and, empty as his treasury was, his zeal for foreign alliances was not damped by the knowledge that he was expected to find funds to put the troops of his allies in motion. Rather than be baffled in his purpose he was even ready to send Buckingham to pledge the Crown plate and jewels to Dutch goldsmiths. And, as if the Duke had not enough to do at home, a fleet also was to be equipped to attack the Spanish ports, of which he was to have the command, with the title of

<sup>1</sup> From June 18 to July 11, twenty-three days ; from August 1 to August 12, exactly thirty-five days.

'generalissimo,' one which, it has sometimes been said, was invented by Richelieu for himself, a few years later, when he laid aside his Cardinal's robes for helmet and cuirass, and, priest as he was, took the command of the French army in the Italian campaign.

But as no loans so raised could meet the expenditure required by such extensive schemes of foreign policy, Charles was compelled to summon a fresh Parliament. It augured ill for the chance of his agreeing with it better than with the preceding one, that in the course of the winter Buckingham prevailed on him to discard Williams, by far the shrewdest member of his Council; and within a very few weeks it became apparent that a second rupture was unavoidable; the Commons, while professing a loyal willingness to grant supplies, showing at the same time a resolution to know how the money which they were prepared to vote would be spent, and to institute a rigid inquiry into abuses and grievances; and Charles, reproving them for wasting time in such investigations, which he enjoined them at all events to postpone to the more pressing business of granting money. Especially he threw his shield over Buckingham: 'In old time it had been said, what shall be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honour? But now it is the labour of some to seek what may be done *against* the man whom the king thinks fit to be honoured'—(ii. 23), and, though the statement was calculated to sweep away the constitutional doctrine of the irresponsibility of the Sovereign and the responsibility of the Ministers, he added 'that it was certain that he had commanded the Duke to do what he had done;<sup>1</sup> that he would not have the House to question his servants; and that he hoped the House itself would join with him in punishing those who should so offend.' The last sentence was so clearly a threat, that it exasperated more than it alarmed, and the next day Eliot denounced Buckingham by name as the cause of most of the evils complained of. Nor did either side confine itself to hard words. Presently the Commons proceeded to order the formal impeachment of the Duke; and Charles not only threw Eliot, and another member, named Digges,

<sup>1</sup> Among the many remarkable parallels which the French Revolution and the reign of Louis XVI. furnish to the events of this time, not the least striking is the resemblance between this declaration of Charles and the language of reproof which on one occasion Vergennes persuaded Louis to address to a deputation from the Parliaments of Paris and of several of the provinces; and in which the King laid down the rule that 'the Councillors were to consider everything done in his name as done by his especial order.'—*France under the Bourbons*, iii. 486.



into prison, but ordered Heath, the Attorney-General, to accuse the Earl of Bristol of high treason, with no other object, as the Earl affirmed, than that of preventing him from appearing as a witness against the Duke, with respect to whom he was in a position to give very damaging evidence. But these acts of violence only betrayed his weakness. He was soon forced to release all but Bristol (the charges against whom were subsequently brought before the Star Chamber, only to be disproved); and after vainly trying to coax or intimidate the Commons into a grant of supply before their complaint against Buckingham was examined, he dissolved this second Parliament also.

He had warned the Commons that it belonged to him alone to call them together or to dispense with them. And, to show that this was not an empty threat, he let nearly two years elapse before he called another Parliament.

At last, however, his necessities overcame his antipathy. He had tried more than one expedient to raise money from his subjects, which he fancied was not illegal because he avoided the use of the term tax or duty; but all his contrivances had proved very unproductive. He had sought to intimidate the opponents of the Court by removing from the commission of the peace those members who had been foremost in resistance or disapproval; not only Eliot, but even Wentworth being visited with the mark of the royal displeasure. And Mr. Gardiner, remarking that 'a Government which could alienate men so opposed to one another as Eliot and Wentworth, must indeed have gone far astray'—(ii. 78), takes occasion once more to point out how great was the difference between the views and positions of these statesmen; and how entirely a correct understanding of those of Wentworth exculpates him from the charge which Pym brought against him, and which has since been often repeated with a bitterness such as is rarely provoked by events long past, of having been bought over by the Court to desert his party:—

'He was longing to enter the service of the Crown. . . . The reforming spirit was strong in him. To him England was a stage on which there was much to be done; many abuses to be overthrown, many interested and ignorant vices to be silenced. Since the days when Bacon had been a member of the House of Commons no man's voice had been raised so frequently in favour of new legislation. Legislation was the only mode in which, as a member of the House, he could proceed to action. But there could be little doubt that he would prefer a shorter course. Power in his own hands would be very welcome to him from whatever quarter it came. . . . A courtier

in the ordinary sense of the word Wentworth never was; never by any possibility could become. . . . Whatever his heart conceived his mouth would speak. And whatever position he occupied he was sure to magnify his office. . . . He indeed could join the leaders of the Opposition in refusing or putting down the supplies which Buckingham needed for the war. But he joined them as one who would gladly be spared the task of resisting the wishes of his sovereign. In short, he was with the Opposition, but not of it. And Charles acknowledged the difference between his resistance and that of some others; and, though he included him in his penal list, spoke of him with kindness as one who might yet be won. Wentworth justified the preference. His objection was not against Charles's system of government, but against the policy pursued by the King and his Minister. Consequently he refused to take measures to evade the restrictions placed upon him. "My rule," he said, "which I will never transgress, is never to contend with the prerogative out of Parliament, nor yet to contest with a King, but when I am constrained thereto, or else make shipwreck of my peace of conscience, which I trust God will ever bless me with, and with courage too to preserve it."

He did not indeed conceive that his desire to avoid a contest with prerogative was to lead him to contribute to one of the forced loans which Charles endeavoured to exact for an object to which he was so averse as a French war, even though for his refusal he was summoned before the Council, and 'sent into confinement, in Kent; the last resource of the King' (and a singular one it was) being 'to banish the leading opposers of the loan to counties as far as possible from their own homes'—(ii. 117). But, when in the spring of 1628, Charles yielded to the compulsion of an empty exchequer, and summoned a third Parliament, Wentworth at once prepared not only to join in but to lead the opposition to the recent measures of the Government. He was not disposed to renew the impeachment of Buckingham; partly perhaps because he considered the Duke had been thoroughly discredited by the recent failure of the expedition to Rochelle, in which he himself had commanded; partly perhaps because it was no secret that, on the first hint of such a step, Charles had made up his mind to repeat the dissolution. But his principal reason was that other objects of more general importance seemed to him and to the other leaders of the country party, to be more immediately pressing. The months which had elapsed since the dissolution of the former Parliament had been marked by continual violations of the rights of the people. The independence of the Judges had been assailed by the dismissal of some of the body. The

Court of the King's Bench had refused to admit to bail some members of the last House of Commons who had been thrown into prison. A new tax, under the name of Ship-money had been levied in every county by the mere order of the Council. Soldiers had been billeted in different parts of the kingdom, for whose maintenance the farmers and shopkeepers could obtain no payment; and whose excesses and extortions caused universal discontent, while the haughty and imprudent imperiousness of the King's language at the opening of the Parliament could not fail to be regarded as an aggravation of the wrong done by his acts. 'If they failed to do their duty' (in providing ample supplies) 'he must, in discharge of his conscience, use those other means which God had put into his hands. They were not to take this as a threat, for he scorned to threaten any but his equals. But he wished them to understand that, though he was willing to forget the distractions of the last Parliament, he expected them to alter their conduct'—(ii. 202).

It was not to be wondered at that such language irritated rather than terrified, and produced a steadfast resolution to put an end to grievances so universally and so deeply felt. Eliot indeed weakened the effect of a powerful denunciation of the past misgovernment by mixing theological questions with political, and affirming that all the evils complained of 'sprang from the danger of innovation in religion'—(ii. 204). But Wentworth's speech was a masterpiece, inspired at once by the most fearless patriotism and the most penetrating statesmanship. 'The business of Parliament,' as he declared, 'was to produce union between the King and the people.' Both had been injured by past evils. Both were interested in finding a remedy for those evils.' And, having enumerated the grievances of the people with unsparing precision, 'illegal punishments and marks of indignation, the raising of loans, the billeting of soldiers, as if the object had been to persuade worlds that the right of empire was to take away by strong hand,' he declared that it was not the King himself who had done these things, but 'projectors, who had extended the prerogative of the King beyond its just symmetry;' and he concluded by declaring his resolution 'to apply himself to make whole all that had been impaired, and to propound a remedy to all these diseases.'

And as he saw that these abuses, unless speedily put an end to, so that they could never be repeated, must tend to lose their temporary character and to become permanent, he was resolved that the House should content itself with no

temporary retractation or remedy, but that it should erect a bulwark strong enough for all time to prevent a recurrence of similar misgovernment. And this could only be done by a formal statute. Historians and constitutional critics have been so unanimous in their appreciation of the great Petition of Right, that Mr. Gardiner may well call it strange that it should have been left to him to throw any new light on the struggle which ended in its enactment—(*Pref.* to vol. i. p. x.) But the 'Notes' of Buckingham's secretary, Nicholas, were written in 'a peculiar semi-shorthand, which seems to have repelled previous investigators,' while a still more elaborate report of the Commons debates on the subject 'lurked unknown in the well-ransacked collection of the Harleian MSS. till he was fortunate enough to light upon it.' By the aid of these invaluable authorities he has been able to show us that, valuable and powerful a resistance to all future encroachments on freedom as was supplied by the Petition of Right, Wentworth had it in his mind to erect a bulwark which should have been still more absolutely impregnable by a formal Bill.

Had Charles been wiser, had he as yet been able to appreciate, as he appreciated afterwards, Wentworth's true character, he would have accepted such a Bill with cordiality. Yet, though he opposed it, there can be no doubt that he believed that in so doing he too was acting in the interest of the people, who were concerned equally with himself in the upholding of his lawful prerogative. The Commons, under Wentworth's guidance, passed resolutions condemning any attempt to levy money which they had not voted, and any punishment of those who refused to pay. But they were willing, if satisfied on these points, to grant an ample supply, and to leave its expenditure wholly to the Government. But Charles resented all attempts to fetter him by positive enactments. He was willing to make informal promises, to assure the Houses 'that he would not again put in force the extraordinary powers of which they complained. But he firmly believed that these extraordinary powers were part of the inheritance of the Crown, and he was resolved not to divest himself of them'—(ii. 221).

Some days were occupied by a series of resolutions, promises, and remonstrances, alternating with each other. The advocacy of Charles's views by some of the inferior Ministers was so unskillful as to injure his cause rather than promote it. The Secretary, Sir John Coke, declared the question at issue to be whether the Houses 'would or would not believe the King's royal word and promise.' The Solicitor-

General argued that a Bill must be needless, because a good king would not need it and a bad king could not be bound by it; to which Wentworth replied by expressing a hope 'that the question whether the King be above the law or the law above the King might never be stirred.' But he stood firmly to his original view, that there must be a distinct Act of Parliament, a measure which Charles was equally resolved to avoid. Charles still thought that he had a right to expect the Houses to be satisfied with vague general promises, and summoned them to his presence to receive from his own lips a resolution which had at least as much of admonition in it as of promise. In a severe tone he declared that 'he held Magna Charta to be in force, but he would not hear of any encroachment upon that sovereignty or prerogative which God had put into his hands for the good of his people'—(ii. 246).

We cannot wonder that the Commons were not satisfied, nor that they replied with a remonstrance embodying the arguments already brought forward by Wentworth. But Charles held his ground, and in consideration of the impossibility of compelling his assent to it, the idea of proceeding by Bill was at last abandoned.

'Wentworth's hopes were baffled. He had hoped to reconcile the King and his subjects. His idea of kingship was a high one; too high, indeed, for the circumstances of the time. But he regarded it as Bacon had regarded it, as part of the constitution of England, as bound to act in consonance with the laws, and only rising above them because no written laws could possibly provide for all the emergencies which might arise. For Charles the kingship was something different from this, something divine in its origin and unlimited in its powers. Therefore, even if he was willing to agree that he would not repeat the actions which had given just offence in the preceding year, he was not willing to bind himself to more. He would surrender the abuse, the authority from which the abuse sprang he would not surrender'—(ii. 247).

Charles, on the other hand, had triumphed, but he gained nothing by his victory. Three days after the abandonment of the Bill it was brought forward in another form, that of the immortal Petition of Right. And in some respects the Petition made a greater inroad on his system of government than had been attempted by the Bill; for the Petition contained a recital of past grievances from which the Bill had abstained, and moreover, as was argued by some of the advocates of the Petition, 'it was better than a Bill, for by it the Houses would have an answer before they sent up the subsidies. A Petition must receive an immediate answer. A

Bill would be sent up at the end of the Session, and what were there to hinder the King from accepting the subsidies and rejecting the Bill?'—(ii. 251).

Our space is too limited, and the leading circumstances of the discussions which followed have been too fully and frequently narrated to make it necessary for us here to recapitulate them in detail. The Petition passed the Commons in two days, and was sent to the Lords, who referred it to a Committee; and though some amendments introduced in the Upper House 'were intended to render the condemnation of the Government less abrupt,' yet, on the whole, Mr. Gardiner pronounces the report of the Committee to 'contain the severest censure to which any King of England had submitted since the days of Richard II.'—(ii. 253.)

In his relation of the debates our historian takes occasion to correct one expression of Pym (now rapidly rising into a commanding position in the House) which has been hitherto quoted thus:—'We cannot *leave* the King sovereign power, for *he* never was possessed of it.' Mr. Gardiner maintains that his words were 'for *we* were never possessed of it,' meaning, as he explains the phrase, 'we can only leave what we have control over; this is beyond our control'—(ii. 258). The point is not of great importance; but we certainly prefer the common reading. In the first place it is more consistent with '*leave*;' since that could not be left to the King which he never had had at all. And, secondly, though to do so might have been a betrayal of their trust, so great a stickler for the power of Parliament as Pym was, would hardly have affirmed that even the admission of sovereign or absolute power was beyond its competency to make.

The contest in the Lords was not less animated than that in the Commons; and Mr. Gardiner deservedly claims credit for being the first person to give a full account of their proceedings on the subject, on which 'writers have hitherto been contented to guess; and have frequently guessed wrong'—(Pref. xi.), as they have done especially in the case of Bishop Williams, 'who turns out to have had nothing to do with the additional clause reserving sovereignty to the Crown, which is usually attributed to him;' and to have been innocent of those intrigues 'against the Petition which have called forth such denunciations of his conduct.'

Buckingham's resistance to the Petition, which he carried on in a most imperious tone, as if every clause depended on his consent, was far more vigorous than could be made by his underlings. Indeed so difficult did it seem to overbear him,



that Eliot proposed to act without reference to the Upper House; a suggestion which was at once rejected by the more statesmanlike intelligence of Wentworth, 'whose mind was full of schemes for alteration and reform; and who was an advocate of the constitutional forms which had existed in the days of his youth. Early in the Session he had announced that the Commons could do nothing without the King; he now announced that they could do nothing without the Lords'—(ii. 262.)

Undeniable as the assertion was on every constitutional principle, it provoked Eliot into a singular display of ill-temper; and he forgot himself so much as even to charge 'Wentworth with deserting the cause he had once espoused.' Such an accusation the great framer of the Petition disdained to notice. His defence was the practical one of reasserting the importance of every article which it contained, and his own resolution to adhere to every one of them, though not unaware that 'the resolutions, in the opinion of wise men, stretched very far on the King's power, and if they were kept punctually, would give a blow to government:' an opinion in which Mr. Gardiner so fully coincides that he affirms that 'whether the Commons were right or wrong, the Petition contained within it the germ of a revolution'—(ii. 263.)

Hume had expressed the same opinion before; at last the Petition was passed by both Houses, but it was not without great reluctance that Charles could bring himself to ratify it. Had not intelligence of disasters to the Protestant arms in France and Germany arrived in the same week, Mr. Gardiner thinks he would have refused his assent altogether. Still in his manifest reluctance our historian sees evidence, not of hostility to the people, but of his rigid honesty. 'The Lords had distinctly spoken of his prerogative as something untouched by the Petition; and even the Commons had declared that they had no intention of encroaching upon it. A hypocritical prince would perhaps have been content with this; would have assented to the Petition, and tacitly reserved for himself the right of breaking it afterwards'—(ii. 274). He, on the contrary, would deceive neither others nor himself as to the sense in which he assented, if he should assent; and therefore publicly consulted the Judges on the effect of different articles, especially those which affected his claim to imprison without showing cause. And, when he found their opinion adverse to his own notions of his rights, in spite of the bad news from abroad, he sought to evade the sacrifice demanded of him by an informal answer, which in

general terms promised and enjoined adherence 'to the laws and customs of the realm.' His object was of course transparent. The Commons were indignant, and all their indignation was again poured out on the Duke, who was branded by name as the cause of all the evils. A remonstrance was proposed; an impeachment was not obscurely hinted at. It was to no purpose that Finch, the Speaker, announced that he had instructions to interrupt any member who reflected on any Minister of State; or that Charles himself sent down a message to the House couched in terms of angry and menacing reproof. The excitement surpassed all previous agitation. As some of the journals consulted by Mr. Gardiner relate, the Speaker wept with perplexity; and even the hard, fierce old Chief Justice, Sir E. Coke, was for a moment unable to express his sentiments. 'With the tears running down his furrowed face, he stood up, faltered, and sat down again'—(p. 286). The Lords, though less impulsive, showed no less resolution than the Commons. Even Buckingham was unable to oppose himself to the current; till at last the King gave way, and on June 7 pronounced the old legal form of Royal Assent—adding a few words of (for him) more than usual graciousness. He declared that 'he had always meant to confirm all their liberties, knowing, according to their own protestations, that they neither meant to nor could hurt his prerogative. And he assured them that his maxim was that the people's liberties strengthen the king's prerogative, and that the king's prerogative is to defend the people's liberties.'

The most resolute patriot could hardly have wished to put both prerogative and liberty on a more healthy foundation than that which was thus laid down by Charles. But he deceived himself when he expected that either his words of grace and wisdom, or even his assent to the Petition, would suffice to allay all the discontent of the Commons, so long as Buckingham's influence remained predominant; or to extinguish their animosity against the Duke himself. He closed his speech with the statement that 'he had shown himself ready to satisfy their demands, so that he had done his part; wherefore, if the Parliament had not a happy conclusion, the sin was theirs; he was free from it'—(ii. 291). For the moment indeed they seemed to agree with him; and the people outside the House more than shared their feelings. 'The acclamations of the Commons arose; the shout was taken up without as the news spread from street to street. The steeples of the City churches rang out their merriest peals. As the dusk deepened into darkness bonfires were lighted up amidst

rejoicing crowds. Since the day when Charles had returned from Spain, no such signs of public happiness had been seen.

But the satisfaction was only partial and temporary. The Commons were so far appeased that they at once granted a liberal vote of supply; but there were still what seemed to them to be grievances, though they had not been, nor could have been inserted in the Petition; and these they were embodying in a remonstrance, which not even the great concession now made would induce them to give up. It was an unhappy characteristic of the time, and one perhaps more full of evil omen for the future than any other, that once more religion, if it be not profaning the term to apply it to an intolerant enforcement of one narrow theological system, occupied a more prominent place in their minds than the gravest questions of foreign policy or constitutional privilege. Yet so it was; the Commons still persisted in completing a remonstrance which they had begun to draw up some weeks before; and in it a denunciation of Arminianism, and complaints that books had been licensed which were unfavourable to the doctrines of Calvin, were given a marked precedence over allegations 'of the excessive power of the Duke of Buckingham,' and the abuse of that power. Charles, though little inclined to Puritanism, placed these matters in a very different order. In the hope of drawing the Commons off from their attacks on the Duke, he was willing to disown the Arminians, 'which,' says Mr. Gardiner, 'he might easily do, as Laud and his friends (as yet) entirely disclaimed the title.' But 'to abandon the Duke was to abandon himself'—(ii. 301); and the murder in a street riot of Dr. Lambe, a quack doctor, who was generally regarded as a creature of Buckingham's, made Charles only the more resolute to protect him. With such a warning before his eyes, he looked on 'the movement against Buckingham as nothing more than a decent veil for an outbreak against popular anarchy;' and while he refused the Duke permission to answer the charges brought against him, he addressed a stern reproof to the House, for making so ungrateful a return to his recent great concession in assenting to the Petition of Right.

It was an ill-advised indication of displeasure; for, in spite of their recent vote of supply, the King was still to a certain degree in the power of the Commons. And not only were their leaders men far more likely to be exasperated than intimidated by such rebuke, but they had abundant evidence that the nation was with them. 'Who rules the kingdom?' were

the words of a pasquinade found nailed to a house in Coleman Street; 'the King. Who rules the King? the Duke. Who rules the Duke? the Devil. Let the Duke look to it' (ii. 305). And, strong in this support, they proceeded to draw up a fresh remonstrance on the old subject of Tonnage and Poundage; and, as a prorogation was notoriously at hand, they 'proposed to pass a temporary Bill to save the rights which they claimed in this matter.' Charles had no mind to give time for the framing of such a Bill. The language of the new remonstrance, that 'the receiving of Tonnage and Poundage, which had not been granted by Parliament, was a breach of the liberties of this kingdom, and contrary to his Majesty's assent to the Petition of Right,' he regarded as at once a personal insult and a practical injury, since 'it would make it impossible for him to govern the kingdom, except in accordance with the views of the House of Commons' (ii. 306.) And he determined at once to prorogue the Parliament before such a remonstrance could be presented, avowing that his object was to prevent its presentation.

In his review of the Session Mr. Gardiner examines the position of affairs and the conduct of both parties with careful impartiality. As he views it, 'the crisis was more serious, the breach more complete and hopeless than ever before. . . . The King's whole policy was to be changed at home and abroad, his whole personal feeling was to be sacrificed by the condemnation of Laud and Neile,<sup>1</sup> as well as of the great Duke himself.' But he lays the chief blame on the Commons, and regards their resolution which condemned the collection of Tonnage and Poundage after the Judges had decided in favour of the King's right to levy it, as an attempt to give a resolution of their single House a validity equal to that of a formal political decision of the Courts of Law, which could lead to nothing 'but a tyranny such as enabled Cromwell to turn the key on the expelled Long Parliament, and which, in the following century, roused the thinking part of the nation in defence of a man so unworthy as Wilkes'—(ii. 310). Moreover, he impugns the honesty of the Commons in affirming that the Petition of Right barred the sovereign from levying Tonnage and Poundage. Not only had lawyers constantly 'held that a customs' duty was something of a kind altogether different from a tax;' but 'it is as certain as anything can well be, that the Commons never had any intention to include the question of Tonnage

<sup>1</sup> The Bishop of Winchester.

and Poundage in the Petition of Right'—(ii. 311). At the same time he balances his blame of them by granting that, 'if formally in the wrong, they may have been materially in the right;' and, while on that particular question he defends the King, he at the same time severely condemns him for 'blindness, narrow-mindedness, obstinacy, and an habitual disregard of that primary axiom of government, that men cannot be driven, though they may be led.'

In Mr. Gardiner's opinion Buckingham was more alive to the perilous nature of the crisis than Charles, and showed his consciousness of it 'in a desire to meet Parliament, when it should re-assemble, in something like a conciliatory spirit,'—(ii. 320). Lord Bristol and Lord Arundel were restored to favour: Weston was made Lord Treasurer, while Wentworth was raised to the peerage, and was also, on Weston's introduction, received into favour by Charles. Whether it were beneficial to the nation 'thus to remove from the Commons the only man among its leaders who had shown anything like power of constructive statesmanship,' Mr. Gardiner is very doubtful; but than his defence of Wentworth himself nothing can be more conclusive:—

'From that time to this no word has been found too hard for the great apostate, the unworthy deserter of the principles of his youth. Those who have studied the true records of the Session which had just come to an end, are aware that he was neither an apostate nor a deserter. The abuses struck at by the Petition of Right he regarded as prejudicial to government as well as injurious to the subject; when they had been swept away he was free to take his own course, and that course must have been greatly determined by the proceedings of the Commons in the last days of the Session. With Puritanism he had no sympathy whatever: he had no confidence in the House of Commons as an instrument of government, and regarded some of its recent declarations on the subject of Tonnage and Poundage as a proclamation inviting to anarchy'—(ii. 321).

But he distrusted Buckingham still more, and, for ourselves, we fail to see how, if the Duke had lived, a place could ever have been found for him in the Councils of the King. Wentworth's worse as well as his better qualities, his proud, overbearing disposition as well as his consciousness of pre-eminent ability and honest zeal for the State, alike forbade it. No two men in the kingdom was it so impossible to bring together in co-operation. That difficulty, however, was not destined to continue. While Buckingham was fitting out a fresh expedition to Rochelle, in the vain hope of wiping away

the disgrace of his former failure, one of his old officers, stung by his gross personal insults, and rendered desperate by the refusal of promotion to which he conceived himself entitled, and by the withholding of his pay, which he had certainly earned, murdered him at Portsmouth. Foul as the crime was, the people in general, and especially the Londoners, heard of it with exultation. But Charles bewailed him 'with bitter tears and lamentations,' and set himself to do honour to the memory of his favourite, by giving his personal superintendence to the equipping of the Rochelle fleet. Its result only showed the want of judgment with which the expedition had been planned. Lord Lindsey, to whom, on the Duke's death, the command had been given, found himself utterly unable to force his way through the moles with which Richelieu had barred the entrance to the harbour. A great portion of his force consisted of merchant-vessels, whose masters had no appetite for encountering any danger that could be avoided; and it might be said that the British only came in sight of the city to behold its surrender, and perhaps to flatter themselves that the tolerant humanity with which the Cardinal used his victory was in some degree due to the interest their king had shown in the fate of the subdued Huguenots.

With these transactions, according to Mr. Gardiner's views, one period of Charles's reign ends. He doubts indeed whether Buckingham had ever exerted the absolute dominion over Charles which he was 'commonly thought' to have exerted, and believes 'that Charles's tenacity and self-sufficiency had to the full as large a share in the mischief as the presumptuous optimism of his favourite'—(ii. 339). However this may be, it is universally agreed that after the Duke's death Charles took the government of the State on himself more visibly than before; and, as we have already pointed out, Mr. Gardiner proclaims the fact by the title of his third and fourth volumes, 'The Personal Government of Charles.' As he tells us, 'the King at once announced his intention of presiding continually at the Council, and ordered each Minister to report directly to himself on the business entrusted to his charge'—(iii. 2). Nor was it a merely formal presidency which he was contented to exercise. On the contrary, Ranke affirms that 'on all important questions he expressed his opinion so decidedly that no one ventured to contradict him;'<sup>1</sup> and before the end of the year he followed up his announcement by a declaration providing for the determina-

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, ii. 2.



tion of all theological disputes and the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs generally, which showed that he intended to exercise an active superintendence over every kind of business, whether civil or spiritual. And the character of the new Lord Treasurer was favourable to his prosecution of such a purpose, since Weston, though a prudent and judicious Finance Minister, was too eager to keep his place to offer any opposition to his royal master's declared intentions.<sup>1</sup>

Unluckily, like Louis XIV. forty years later, Charles could not perceive that the affairs of a whole kingdom were too various to be conducted by a single mind, however well informed. At this moment questions of foreign policy occupied as large a space in his eyes as the internal government of his kingdom. But not only were the means by which he proposed to obtain his objects abroad inconsistent with each other, but all of them were incompatible with the design which in all probability he had begun also to entertain, of avoiding any immediate summons to the prorogued Parliament to re-assemble for a second session. His great object was the recovery of the Palatinate for his brother-in-law; and he had so high an opinion of his own diplomatic abilities that he doubted not being able to use both France and Spain as tools to effect his purpose. He failed to see that the mutual jealousy of these two nations rendered it hopeless to induce both to act with him cordially; though both were willing to amuse him with specious promises, in order 'to secure the neutrality, if not the alliance of England in the conflict with one another' for which both were preparing—(iii. 10.)

In suffering himself to be thus played with, he no doubt lacked statesmanlike sagacity; but it does not follow, as Mr. Gardiner would seem to imply, that his object was ill chosen. It was not only natural for him to desire to aid his kinsman, but his feeling on this point was wholly in harmony with that of his subjects, on no subject more unanimous; and success would have been the most important service that could have been rendered to the cause of Protestantism. On the other hand, in his endeavours to remove the question of his right to Tonnage and Poundage from the decision of Parliament to that of the Courts of Law, Gardiner allows Charles the praise of cleverness and tact, though he contends that 'it was impossible to allow any mere interpretation of the law to decide the question at issue'—(iii. 13). But once again political questions were complicated and exasperated by theological

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, ii. 7.

quarrels; and it is hard altogether to acquit some of the clergy of what, in modern language, may be called the extreme High Church party, of imprudence in connecting their religious doctrines with arbitrary power, much as Sacheverell did eighty years later, in a way that perhaps gratified the King, but which certainly injured his cause and their own.

Yet, even if such ideas were secretly not displeasing to Charles, they were not such as Laud, the divine with whom in such matters Charles chiefly took counsel, desired to see publicly inculcated. Laud was not in every point a large-minded or judicious adviser. But, on the other hand, he was far from being wholly swayed by the narrow views which have been generally imputed to him; and, though he is clearly no favourite with Mr. Gardiner, who is never so little impartial as in explaining the differences which separated the Episcopalians from the Puritans; yet even he from time to time lets fall expressions which show plainly enough how bright a side there was to the prelate's character. 'Peace was the object which he pursued,' a praise which, however, is qualified by the addition that it was peace even in preference to truth. He had a deep 'dislike of arrogant and self-sufficient dogmatists,' and, like his royal master, 'no taste for dogmatic controversy; believing that it only served to distract the clergy from their real work; and he looked with the contempt of a practical man upon the endless discussions of problems which it was impossible for the human intellect to solve'—(iii. 35, 155). With the Puritans a love of peace was a 'proof of lukewarmness: controversy and conflict were dear to them, whether the cause of dispute were the 'abstruse doctrines of grace and predestination,' or the promotion of Montague to a bishopric. And Mr. Gardiner admits that their system 'had its narrowness,' and that many of the most vehement and influential of their leaders were 'men who had no broad intelligence or spiritual insight, no quality to inspire respect except that dogged persistency in support of that which they believed to be true, which is in itself a virtue'—(iii. 25).

Such was the state of affairs when at the beginning of 1629 Charles re-assembled the Parliament. But our space forbids us to dwell on the incidents which marked its brief session; and which we may pass over the more contentedly since they have been related so frequently and so fully that even Mr. Gardiner's diligence has not been able to add anything that is new to the narrative. In too many respects the proceedings were creditable to neither party, neither to the King nor to the leaders of the Opposition; but, while the

Session lasted, the greater errors were manifestly committed by Eliot and his friends. In spite of the favourable decision of the Judges, Charles, in a set speech, formally disavowed all intention of levying duties by 'virtue of hereditary prerogative;' and condescended to explain 'that he had not intended to challenge Tonnage and Poundage of right, but for expedience, showing to Parliament the necessity, not the right, by which he was to take it until they had granted it to him; assuring himself, according to their general profession, that they wanted time and not good-will to give it to him'—(iii. 50). But though 'the first impression made by this speech was extremely favourable,' so much so that, 'in a manner contrary to all precedent, instead of being listened to in respectful silence, it was many times interrupted by sounds of applause,' the *odium theologicum* had such entire possession of the leaders of the Opposition, that no condescension or moderation of the King could allay it; and, chiefly under the influence and guidance of Eliot, they passed a series of votes against 'Jesuits and Arminians,' which Mr. Gardiner admits could only be justified by arguments which 'may be used to justify a revolution; and which, in fact, meant nothing less than a declaration of war against the King'—(iii. 61, 62). The last expression may be rather too strong, but undoubtedly the proceedings of the Commons justified Charles in his resolution to mark his disapproval by a speedy dissolution. And he was more justified still by the tumultuous conduct of some of the Presbyterian members on the last day of the Session, when they actually laid violent hands on their own Speaker, and held him down in his chair by force, that a fresh set of resolutions prepared by Eliot might be voted before the King could summon them to hear their sentence of dismissal.

In examining the votes passed by Charles's second Parliament Mr. Gardiner cannot forbear once more expressing a severe disapproval of many of them. 'It would be unfair to deny that the germ of much that was evil existed in the pretensions of the House of Commons, . . . and it is not possible to deny that the growing ascendancy of the House of Commons, desirable as it was, had yet its ugly side; that it might come to represent the interests rather than the wisdom of the nation; and that, unless the national mind were aroused to reverence for justice, it might be as arbitrary as Charles had ever been'—(ii. 177). And, if the King had now behaved with prudence and magnanimity, it is hardly conceivable that the disorderly and scandalous scene which closed the Session could have failed to startle many sober-minded

observers, and to lead them to doubt whether, with all his high-flown ideas of his prerogative, he were not of the two the safer guardian of their liberties. Unhappily, however, Charles was too angry to be magnanimous, or even prudent. Though we can hardly doubt that he was determined to summon no new Parliament so long as he could avoid it, he yet resolved to inflict on those who had given him the deepest offence such punishment as should also serve as a warning to members of future Parliaments, whenever one should re-assemble. In defiance of the law, which secured freedom of speech to every Peer and every representative of the people, nine members were instantly committed to prison; and, though in the course of the summer the majority of them were released on making satisfactory submission, Eliot, with Holles and Valentine, the members who had borne the chief part in the assault on the Speaker, were prosecuted at the beginning of the next year, and sentenced to the payment of heavy fines; and, as Eliot would neither pay the fine nor acknowledge his offence, he was kept in uninterrupted confinement, to which his death, in less than three years afterwards, may probably be in great measure attributed. Worthy of admiration and of grateful recollection, as in many respects he was, still, as we have seen, many of the measures which he had urged on the House of Commons were, even in the judgment of those most favourable to him, incompatible with the respect due to the sovereign and with the authority which the Constitution conferred on him. He had given Charles what was probably still deeper offence by an invective against Buckingham, in which, shortly before that favourite's death, he had compared him to Sejanus, a parallel which, as Charles interpreted it, could only hold good if he himself resembled Tiberius. But the revenge which Charles took was beneath a king, as also in its lawless disregard of the privileges of Parliament, it must, we fear, be held to counterbalance the bigotry and violence of his victim and his fellow-sufferers.

In the interval between the prorogation and re-assembling of the Parliament, Charles had gained the active support of a counsellor whose rare wisdom and administrative powers had, till the Royal Assent was given to the Petition of Right, been commonly displayed in opposition. Wentworth had not, on his promotion to the Peerage, been at once admitted among the King's counsellors; but, in the course of the ensuing winter, he received the honourable appointment of the Presidency of the North, and at once began to display his great administrative powers in that office. We have

already seen how vigorously and successfully Mr. Gardiner defends him from the charge of having been unfaithful to the principles with which he had set out. It is but a carrying out of his previous argument when he now represents him, not so much a champion of absolute monarchy against liberty, as 'a defender of order against disorder'—(iii. 42). In his admirable lectures on the History of France,<sup>1</sup> Sir James Stephen describes the 'political despotism which Richelieu sought to erect as not a despotism like that of Constantinople and Teheran, but a power which, being restrained by religion, by learning, and by public spirit, was to be exempted from all other restraints: a dynasty which, like a kind of subordinate providence, was to spread wide its aims for the guidance and shelter of the subject multitude, itself the while inhabiting a region too lofty to be ever darkened by the mists of human weakness or of human corruption.' Wentworth's views of the province of the monarchy, as they are painted by Mr. Gardiner, were not unlike those of the great Cardinal, and, whatever difference there was, may be said to have been in the Englishman's favour, inasmuch as there is in them a greater idea of reciprocity, and as they fully recognised the principle which Richelieu ignored, that, if his people owed much to the sovereign, he on his part owed no little to them. 'Princes,' as Wentworth said in his opening speech at York,

'are like indulgent nursing fathers to their people; their modest liberties, their sober rights, ought to be precious in their eyes, the branches of their government be for shadow, for habitation, the comfort of life. They repose safe and still under the protection of their sceptres. Subjects, on the other side, ought, with solicitous eyes of jealousy, to watch over the prerogatives of a Crown. The authority of a king is the keystone which closeth up the arch of order and government, which contains each part in due relation to the whole, and which once shaken and infirmed, all the frame falls together into a confused heap of foundation and battlement, of strength and beauty. Furthermore, subjects must lay down their lives for the defence of kings freely, till those offer out of their store freely, like our best grounds, *qui majore ubertate gratiam quietis referre solent*. Verily there are those mutual intelligences of love and protection descending, and loyalty ascending, which should pass and be the entertainments between a king and his people.'

And his idea of the duty of Ministers is that 'their faithful servants must look equally on both, weave and twist these two together in all their counsels, study and labour to preserve each without diminishing or enlarging either; and by

<sup>1</sup> Lecture xx. vol. ii. p. 317.

running in the worn, wonted channels, treading the ancient bounds, cut off early all disputes from betwixt them'—(iii. 41). It was thus he

'Taught power's due use to people and to kings ;'

and though these eloquent sentences undoubtedly contemplate far fewer limitations on the will of the monarch than are consistent with a modern idea of a free constitution, or indeed than were consistent with the ancient charters of the realm, had they not been read by the interpretation of a century and more of Tudor tyranny, yet it is quite evident that Wentworth was at least equally anxious for the welfare of the subject as for that of the king. As Mr. Gardiner comments on his speech, 'A king thoroughly well meaning and prudent, counsellors intelligent and patriotic, a people ever outstripping the government in its zeal to carry out the royal commands, such was Wentworth's vision of the commonwealth, which he hoped to see 'flourishing upon English soil.' The parallel between him and Richelieu struck him, as it had struck Stephen. But he gives the preference to our countryman, and boasts that 'England may well be proud of possessing in Wentworth a nobler statesman than Richelieu, of the type to which the great Cardinal belonged ;' and he ascribes to him a large philanthropy as a ruling motive of his career. 'He was more solicitous for the internal welfare of his country than Richelieu was . . . the prosperity of the poor, of the weak, of all who had none to help them, held a larger place in his imagination'—(iv. 331).

Unluckily, he was not the only, nor as yet the chief adviser of the King. Charles, though well-meaning, was not sagacious in his discernment of talent or character ; and the adviser by whose counsels he was for the next few years principally swayed, so far as he was not his own guide to himself, was not gifted with any high political intelligence. Even while at York Wentworth was too far from the Court for his voice to be often heard ; when, as soon happened, he was removed to Dublin, it was only at rare intervals that it could reach the royal ear. But Laud, who on Abbot's death, a year or two afterwards, was promoted to the Primacy, was always at hand ; and there were not wanting reasons why he should be regarded by Charles as the more acceptable counsellor. 'Wentworth's attachment to him, though not without a romantic tinge, was political at bottom. Laud regarded him

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Man*, iii. 289.



with the warmest personal affection. Nor did Laud, like Wentworth, soar into regions into which Charles was incapable of following him'—(iii. 176). It might be added that Laud had never opposed him on any point; while Wentworth had on more questions than one resisted him stoutly; and, though his promotion was a proof that Charles had, more cordially than was his wont, forgiven the opposition, it was hardly to be wondered at if he could not as yet feel as complete confidence in his undeviating submission to his opinions and designs, as he might certainly reckon on from the Archbishop. Ranke regards it as a peculiarity in Charles's character, that at all times he 'bestowed his exclusive confidence on one person alone.'<sup>1</sup> But it may be doubted whether, if confidence be complete, it can be divided among many. At all events, the King's esteem and affection were at first monopolised by Laud; and it was probably owing to the Archbishop, who, with more sagacity than he always showed, soon began to recognise at once an associate and a master-spirit in the great Northern statesman, that Charles also gradually learnt to appreciate both his genius and his loyalty.

For the first few years after the dissolution in 1629, foreign affairs were those in which Charles took the closest interest. And in his conduct of them he scarcely asked advice, and would very rarely have brooked suggestions adverse to his wishes. We fear we must agree with Mr. Gardiner that it argues a great want of statesmanship in his designs that he seems to have been totally insensible to the difficulty of executing them; and that he not only expected his Ministers to be merely dutiful instruments in carrying them out, but that he looked for almost equal deference from the different foreign Powers whose co-operation he desired. His object was single enough, the recovery of the Palatinate for his brother-in-law; but never probably in the history of diplomacy was any one end pursued with such a variety of means. The student of the history of these times is bewildered with negotiations carried on, almost simultaneously, with Spain, with France, with Sweden, with Holland; to every one of which States Charles in one month or another proposes alliance against some of the others. One day he receives a French ambassador, the Marquis de Chateauneuf, whose mission, however, soon comes to nothing, partly because the shrewd Frenchman perceives the weakness of the English Government; partly, and perhaps more, because he ventures

<sup>1</sup> *History of England*, ii. 33.

to recommend the King to summon a new Parliament. A week or two later the celebrated Rubens arrives in London in a semi-official capacity, as a confidential messenger from the Spanish Minister; but though no one could have been more acceptable than the great painter to a King who was one of the most discerning patrons of art that ever adorned a throne, his errand was equally bootless at the time; though at a later period a treaty of peace, though not of active alliance, was signed at Madrid, and the 'King of Spain promised to do his best for the restoration of the Palatinate'—(iii. 215). Charles, in his elation, 'ordered bonfires to be lighted in the streets of London;' but the Prince of Orange, with more acute foresight, warned Sir Henry Vane that 'neither the Upper nor the Lower Palatinate would ever be restored by treaty.' And in fact, though those who guided the Spanish councils for some time amused Charles with foreign hopes, they in reality held him and his power in slight esteem. The Spanish envoy in London, Necolalde, 'wrote home that Charles had but little courage and little money, and Olivares cordially agreed with Necolalde'—(iv. 81). At last his sister herself learnt to desist from expecting efficacious service from his support; and, as time wore on, his affairs at home began to make such calls on his attention, that he had little time or thought to spare for interference with foreign States.

These difficulties of his home government resolved themselves almost wholly into financial embarrassments, or into constitutional questions which arose out of them. The exchequer was soon exhausted, commerce and trade were languishing. Without fresh supplies of money the Government could not go on; and the only constitutional mode of obtaining supplies was that to which Charles had resolved not to have any present recourse, the convoking of a new Parliament. At such a crisis it was unfortunate for him that Noy, a shrewd but narrow-minded lawyer, who in the early Parliaments of the reign had been a follower of Wentworth, had followed him also in taking service under the Crown as Attorney-General. For he had at his finger's ends all the different modes of exacting money which had at any time been practised by former kings; while he was devoid of the statesmanlike prudence which might have warned him that laws or practices which had been disused for centuries were practically almost as much repealed by such disuse as by a formal vote of Parliament. So now, under his advice, and that of others like him, an old statute was exhumed which gave the King a right to summon every one who was possessed

of an estate worth 40*l.* a year, to receive knighthood, and to impose heavy fines on any who might neglect to obey the summons. Still larger sums were procured by proceedings against noblemen who, by buildings or clearings, had transgressed the boundaries of different royal forests; though to find even a colour for such measures, it was necessary to declare the invalidity of a perambulation of the forests which had been made in the reign of Edward I., and had ever since been considered conclusive, and even to deny the authority of the Lord Treasurer, or of any one but the King himself, to authorise any transgression. Another expedient was to institute prosecutions in the Star Chamber against wealthy persons charged with every variety of offence; numbers of whom were convicted and sentenced to pay fines of an amount which, even at the present day, would be considered enormous, fines of 5,000*l.*, 8,000*l.*, and even 10,000*l.* No one practice of this part of the reign has more impressed modern readers with a greater idea of its tyranny. Yet, if Mr. Gardiner be correct, it was impolicy rather than severity which was demonstrated. The fines exasperated the victims without enriching the Treasury. For Mr. Gardiner is positive that they were never levied, 'nor even intended to be levied' (iii. 82), but were merely adjudged by the Courts as a sort of protest of their own against the practices complained of, and as a warning to the people not to provoke the Government.

Strange to say, these measures produced not only no resistance, but not even any general discontent. Even Tonnage and Poundage was paid in every county with scarcely any objection. Trade was reviving, and those engaged in commerce were 'indisposed to hold back from the pursuit of wealth for the sake of a political principle'—(iii. 206). 'Never, in spite of all that had occurred, had civil war appeared farther off than in the spring of 1633. Never did there seem to be a fairer prospect of overcoming the irritation that had prevailed for years before'—(iii. 322). Even Scotland was comparatively quiet, and Charles, who in 1633 paid his first visit to that country, was crowned at Holyrood amid bursts of 'genuine enthusiasm' on the part of the citizens of Edinburgh. But there were still materials for a conflagration beneath the treacherous crust; and, before the summer of the next year had come round, the fatal ingenuity of Noy had kindled the spark. As we have already seen, it was not the first time that a levy of ship-money had been contemplated as a device for raising money. Indeed, from the times of the Plantagenets it had been accounted the duty of the principal seaport towns to

furnish ships to defend the kingdom against foreign enemies. It was thus that the greater part of the fleet had been raised which scattered the great Armada. In the same way ships had been supplied without demur or reluctance to Charles himself in the first year of his reign; and before his third Parliament met, Buckingham had suggested the demand of ship-money from every part of the kingdom, on the ground that the inland counties were as deeply interested as those on the coast in all that concerned the safety or welfare of the kingdom. The demand had seemed to the Council but a legitimate 'extension of the old principle' (ii. 197), but it had been so resolutely opposed by more than one lord-lieutenant that the project was for the time abandoned.

It may well seem strange that a scheme, in which so rash a Minister as Buckingham had not ventured to persist, should find fresh advocates after his death. But so it was. The idea of exacting the impost by an Order in Council was revived by Noy, and was pronounced legal by the Lord Keeper (Lord Coventry). But it had more defenders than the lawyers; the Earl of Manchester, as a Lord of the Treasury, maintained more positively than even Coventry the King's entire right to enforce the demand, not fearing, by a somewhat strange inference, to found his right in a great measure on the fact that the King had been also reduced to collect Tonnage and Poundage by prerogative, since it had not yet been granted by Parliament—(iv. 89). The Order was issued, the discontent was instant and general; yet for a moment it seemed doubtful whether it would lead to any active demonstration. The city of London did indeed present a petition of remonstrance, but the Lord Mayor was summoned before the Privy Council, and reprimanded so sharply 'for his coldness in the King's service,' that he promised to obey. 'There was a stormy meeting at the Common Council, which resulted in a resolution to submit to the King's orders'—(iv. 90). And, when so powerful a body as the merchants of London was overawed, it seemed hardly likely that any private individual would venture on an encounter from which they shrink. Yet men were found to dare even this. Eight years before, Richard Chambers, a London merchant, had refused payment of Tonnage and Poundage till it should be voted by Parliament, had been thrown into prison for his contumacy, and sentenced to a fine sixfold larger than the duties which had been demanded of him. But the punishment had not broken his spirit, and, taking his stand on his old principle that no tax could be lawfully demanded of the

people which had not been granted by the people's representatives, he now resisted the collectors of ship-money, and in support of his resistance appealed to the Court of King's Bench. The decision was against him, on the ground that 'there was a rule of law and a rule of government, and that many things which might not be done by the one might be done by the other,' a sentence on which Mr. Gardiner truly remarks that 'it was hardly possible to render a worse service to Charles than to proclaim openly from the Bench that Charles's rule was bound by no law'—(iv. 205). And, indeed, such a decision so explained was so far from settling the question that it rather invited a continuance of its agitation. Lord Saye and Sele, a Peer whose generally litigious spirit was further inflamed by the bitterest Puritan bigotry, and who had great influence in Oxfordshire, followed Chambers in his resistance; and when, at the end of the year, a third writ of demand for ship-money was issued, they were followed by one who, with singular good fortune for his fame, has had his name more identified with the resistance than either of his predecessors, and has come to be generally regarded as the national champion in the cause, John Hampden. Mr. Gardiner closes his fourth volume before the time when Hampden's case came to be argued, as it did before the whole Bench, postponing that part of his narrative to a future work. And we therefore may content ourselves here, especially as the issue is so universally known, with the briefest reference to the real views and objects of the great Buckinghamshire squire.

We shall probably not be doing either Chambers or Lord Say and Sele any injustice if we regard Hampden, as Burke did, as that one of the party who was actuated by the most statesmanlike perception of the real magnitude of the principle involved. He was far from being alone in his view; nor was it confined to that which was sometimes known as the country party. Mr. Gardiner tells us that the Earl of Danby, a courtier attached to Charles by the memory of favours received from James, but at the same time an honest and clear-sighted patriot, volunteered a remonstrance to the King against the course he was pursuing. 'He told him, that as an old servant of the Crown he could no longer refrain from representing to him the universal discontent of his subjects: the new levies of money were repugnant to the fundamental laws of England, and to those privileges which their ancestors and themselves had, till the present time, enjoyed. He had spoken to no one who was not ready to shed his blood for his Majesty, and he entreated him to reflect that the only

way of giving satisfaction to his subjects was to summon Parliament'—(iv. 315). Such language bore the unmistakable stamp of sincerity, as well as of the most dutiful loyalty to the King as King. But in Charles's eyes the fidelity to the Crown which it promised was neutralised, and more than neutralised, by the advice contained in the last sentence: for to summon Parliament was the exact step which he was resolved not to take. He saw, and Hampden and his friend saw with equal clearness, that this was the real point at issue. The question whether he could levy a tax, call it Tonnage and Poundage, call it Ship-money, or whatever other name might be devised, by his single edict, was in fact a question whether there should ever again be a Parliament in England. If he could so raise one tax, he could so raise a hundred: if he could supply his necessities without the aid of Parliament for a single month he could do it, and could bequeath to his successors the power of doing it for ever, and Parliament would be but an obsolete institution, a name soon only to be understood or remembered by a few antiquaries. It was to prevent such a consummation that Chambers and Hampden were now striving; and the Parliament that is sitting at this day is the monument of the service that they rendered to their countrymen. If we required any evidence how inseparably our liberties are bound up with the existence of our free Parliament we have only to look at what was taking place at the same era in the neighbouring kingdom of France. There also an ambitious Minister was endeavouring to raise the authority of the sovereign above the law. He was opposed not by one or two country gentlemen and merchants, but by many of the most ancient and powerful of the nobles, by the Princes of the Royal Family, by no small party in the Church, and he had absolutely no support or aid from the King; who, though some partial historians have described him as not without ability, was at all events devoid of any kind of resolution or force of character, was destitute of any semblance of virtue, and was stained with cruelty and perfidy to the very lowest depth of baseness. Yet Richelieu succeeded to the full extent of his design, and, if we attribute his success in part to the general demoralisation of the whole kingdom, and especially of the higher classes which had been wrought by the unbroken profligacy which had stained both Court and Government for more than a century, a still greater share in it may be attributed to the circumstance that the beginning of his Ministerial career was contemporaneous with the extinction of the States-General. The



people had long ceased to look up to their representatives as upholders of their liberties; and there was and is no other body in any country but such a national council, which ever can play such a part.

Mr. Gardiner does not carry his fourth volume beyond the summer of 1637. All important as are the events which he has hitherto described, those which will be the subject of the continuation of his work which we are promised are still more momentous. The continued exercise of that judicial candour with which he has hitherto analysed the actions and motives of both parties will be perhaps more difficult as the incidents to be discussed become more exciting, and the alternatives more awful. But in the same proportion it will also be still more valuable; since the prevailing disposition to increase the power of the masses renders it more important than ever that they should be rightly instructed as to the true nature of real liberty, the foundations on which it must rest, and the supports by which it can alone be preserved.

#### ART. IV.—THE POETRY OF DOUBT.—ARNOLD AND CLOUGH.

1. *Arnold's Poems: Narrative and Elegiac: Dramatic and Lyric.* (London: 1869.)
2. *Clough's Poems.* (London: 1869.)

IN the account of Julius Hare, prefixed to the *Guesses at Truth*, we are told that he made a special entry in some autobiographical memoranda as to the date when he first read Wordsworth. 'To him, as to so many others, that was an epoch in his life,' says his biographer; and we may add that the influence is to be traced in almost every line of his literary work. Again, every reader of J. S. Mill's autobiography will recollect his account of the prolonged melancholy which came over him when a young man. From this, he says, he was relieved chiefly by reading Wordsworth. These two instances are merely casual illustrations of the great influence which Wordsworth exerted on the minds of the generation immediately succeeding his own; and we have called attention to

them now in order that we may have a standard whereby to compare the poets of our time with those of other periods. We have taken Wordsworth as perhaps the greatest instance in our own modern literature of a poet who was a definite teacher. But there are, of course, many similar instances. Byron had just as definite an influence over the minds of his contemporaries; he was an actual leader, if not of thought, at least of sentiment, and the Byronic tendency was plainly visible both in literature and in practice. And it is not only true of the beginning of this century, but in most periods poets have been leaders and teachers, with a definite 'gospel,' as Mr. Carlyle would call it, not so systematic, but quite as influential, as schemes of philosophy or morality. Of course there are many exceptions; there are many dramatic or purely artistic poets whose teaching is only indirect and vague; but, on the whole, it is not difficult to estimate the tendencies of the poetry of any period, inasmuch as those tendencies have been definite and patent. What a poet teaches is not to be found in his longer or more didactic poems only, for there it often misses its effect; it is generally more powerful in the purely lyrical pieces. Insight into Wordsworth's view of nature has been given with greater vividness by *Tintern Abbey*, or by '*Three Years she grew in Sun and Shower*,' than by the *Excursion*. The essential requisite is that the poet himself shall be so informed by some master truth that hardly an utterance of his shall fail to give some expression to it, and his purest poetry will convey it most fully.

Such being one, and surely the highest, of the poet's functions, we have to ask whether it is fulfilled by any of our contemporary poets. We feel that we must answer this question mainly in the negative. We have imitators of Mr. Tennyson, as he has informed us; echoes of Mr. Swinburne are everywhere audible; Mr. Browning's monologues have given rise to many uncouth travesties; but such imitations of popular writers do not imply that these poets have founded schools of thought, or that any one forms his opinions or controls his actions in accordance with their guidance. No doubt among our contemporary poets we can find those who can give expression to deep or lofty thoughts, but is there one whom we can call an original creator, one who can create an ideal, and by the power of his imagination or the universality of his expression can compel the minds of men to follow him in striving after it? The leaders who have really guided thought during our epoch have been, in England, great prose writers on morals or art, such as Mr. Carlyle or

Mr. Ruskin, or great scientific thinkers like Mr. Darwin ; we do not find a poet among the 'kings of modern thought.'

The question then arises, if, in our day, contemporary poetry does not lead the mind of the age, what function does it actually fulfil ? The answer, in our judgment, is not far to seek ; and we reply that it acts not so much as a guide, but as a reflection, of contemporary tendencies. This is not the highest function of the poet, but still it is a high calling, and one which, as regards the present age, so singularly incoherent and confused, so full of vague and inarticulate movements, is no light task. And as a matter of fact, this summing up and expression of these otherwise unexpressed strivings and tendencies is the very office which one of their number calls upon poets to fulfil :—

'Come, Poet, come !

A thousand labourers ply their task,

And what it tends to scarcely ask,

And trembling thinkers on the brink

Shiver, and know not how to think :

To tell the purport of their pain,

And what our silly joys contain ;

In lasting lineaments pourtray

The substance of our shadowy day ;

Our real and inner deeds rehearse,

And make our meaning clear in verse :

Come, Poet, come ! for but in vain

We do the work or feel the pain,

And gather up the seeming gain,

Unless before the end thou come

To take, ere they are lost, their sum.'

(Clough, *Poems*, p. 471.)

This incoherence of modern thought is, perhaps, one of the reasons why our poetry is its reflection and not its guide. For a poet to lead the thought of any period it is necessary that the minds of men should be predisposed to go in certain definite directions, that the paths of possible progress should be broad and well-marked, that there should be a store of energy ready to be directed with overwhelming force into some one of these paths. To be a leader a poet must himself feel the overmastering impulse by which he shall compel men to follow him. If there be no such impulse how can he lead ? If the paths do not lie broad and clear before him, but confused and faint, and too numerous to be rightly discerned, the sensitive mind will turn from them, and its poetry will be no guide, but a mere echo of the hesitation and bewilderment of those who doubt whither to advance. Such an echo is the poetry of our

age. If there be one characteristic common to most of our leading poets, it is that of doubt, hesitation, questioning of all things. Though Blake wrote,

‘If the sun and moon should doubt,  
They’d immediately go out’—

a thought which, in spite of its quaintness, expresses a great truth, yet this age has proved that poetry does not require such unhesitating certainty for its work, and a genuine music has been brought out of doubt and vagueness of belief.

We propose to examine the main characteristics of two of the poets of the day, in order to discover the peculiarity in their mode of echoing the confused murmurs of contemporary voices, and especially their treatment of the deeper questions which agitate modern literature. The two poets whom we shall discuss are not our leading poets, but we have selected them partly because they represent a certain large and important section, though only a section, of University thought and culture, and partly because of their position in regard to religion and faith.

Mr. Arnold is so keenly alive to the vagueness and confusion of modern thought—

‘The hopeless tangle of our age,’

and the difficulty of obtaining a clear answer to the problems that haunt us, that we may almost say that his perception of this is the secret of his charm as a poet. He knows that the poet’s work differs from the musician’s and the artist’s chiefly by reason of its complexity. In the *Epilogue to Lessing’s ‘Laocoön,’* he discusses the cause of the rarity of perfection in poetry compared to music or painting, and finds it in the fact that while painters have only to show one aspect,

‘A moment’s life of things that live,’

and musicians need only

‘The feeling of the moment know’

and give it utterance, the poet has to mirror life’s movement,

‘The thread which binds it all in one,  
And not its separate parts alone.’

And as a poet, scanning life in order to discover this thread, he feels himself hopelessly baffled by the complexity of the modern world. Once he thinks

‘The stream of life’s majestic whole’

flowed unbroken in one deep channel; now it is parted and scattered and wasted, and the poet's efforts to explore its course are mere 'misery and distress.'

Mr. Arnold's view, then, of the world is the view of one who feels himself in the turmoil and confusion of a crowd, who is unable to escape from it altogether, but is determined, as far as in him lies, to counteract the wasting and dispersion of his soul's powers. What he longs for is

'One mighty wave of thought and joy  
Lifting mankind again.'

But this he knows is not to be felt yet in the present; he looks for it to come in the future. In the present we see only

'Blocks of the past, like icebergs high,  
Float on a rolling sea.  
Upon them ply the race of man  
All they before endeavoured;  
They come and go, they work and plan,  
And know not they are severed.'

Till the reunion, the consolidation of the new world out of the fragments of the old, man must endure. That is the great secret of Mr. Arnold's teaching—endurance. This teaching seems to him necessary because of the hopeless sadness of the age; there is no tone of hope or buoyancy in his finest poems. The world is sad, and the saddest thing is that so few see the sadness of it:—

'Ye slumber in your silent grave!  
The world, which for an idle day  
Grace to your mood of sadness gave,  
Long since hath flung her weeds away.  
The eternal trifle breaks your spell;  
But we—we learnt your love too well!  
There yet, perhaps, may dawn an age,  
More fortunate, alas! than we,  
Which without hardness will be sage,  
And gay without frivolity.  
Sons of the world, oh, haste those years;  
But, till they rise, allow our tears!'

Endurance being our duty, we ask, how can man attain to it? It is in Mr. Arnold's answer to this that we perceive the connexion between his prose and his poetry.

Few things are more remarkable, at first sight, than the great difference between Mr. Arnold in prose and Mr. Arnold in poetry. His poems are grave, or rather mournful; they have no irreverence, none of what some call 'delicate banter,'

and others flippancy, no levity in the presence of great problems, and scarcely any bitterness: his prose, as we all know, is the very reverse. We prefer to think that his poetry expresses his mind more truly than his prose, and that we may estimate his tone of thought better by the *Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse*, than by *Friendship's Garland* or *Literature and Dogma*.

But on more careful inspection one sees that the difference is little more than one of form, though in the case of so genuine an artist difference of form involves more than a mere superficial variation of expression. Still, one who has patience to penetrate beyond the form of his writings can see that the answer given, whether in prose or in poetry, to the great questions which he raises, is substantially the same.

Mr. Arnold is known as the preacher of culture; of the duty, under all circumstances, of self-improvement; not with a view to worldly advancement, not as machinery, but as an end in itself. Our duty in life is to aim at perfecting our nature on all its sides, securing for ourselves 'spontaneity of consciousness,' so that above all things we should avoid becoming fixed and immovable in any of our notions or habits. About these we must let 'a stream of fresh thought play freely,' lest we incur that 'failure' which, to quote an extreme votary of culture, 'is to form habits.' Now whether Mr. Arnold's teaching be true or not we do not now attempt to decide; we wish only to point out that it is the teaching of his poetry as well as of his prose, though under a very different form. Whether culture be our duty or not, it is obviously a work that, at least primarily, concerns ourselves; a religion of culture has a tendency to become self-centred. And it is precisely this attribute of self-absorption that we find in Mr. Arnold's poetry. He is possessed with a feeling of the sadness, the vagueness, and incompleteness of our life as it is, and the only thing that we can do now is to endure, and endurance is only possible by self-dependence:—

'With joy the stars perform their shining,  
And the sea its long moon-silvered roll;  
Why?—self-poised they live, nor pine with noting  
All the fever of some differing soul.

'Bounded by themselves, and unregardful  
In what state God's other works may be,  
In their own tasks all their powers pouring,  
These attain the mighty life you see.'

With this conviction the whole problem of life becomes to



the poet not any external truth, not any life or love without him, but the effort to 'possess his soul.' When, in a very beautiful poem, he would find some power in our life to correspond to the 'Palladium' which invisibly preserved Troy, he shows it to be the soul:—

'Still doth the soul, from its lone fastness high,  
Upon our life a ruling effluence send;  
And when it fails, fight as we will, we die,  
And while it lasts, we cannot wholly end.'

This is the remedy for all that we suffer, so far as there is a remedy at all. This formula, for so we may almost call it, Mr. Arnold would apply to all the conditions of our life. And we must notice how it enters into every part of his emotional or intellectual being. It colours his view of human love, of philanthropy, of the world's progress, of religion.

Self-absorption is dominant in his treatment of human love. The series of poems entitled *Switzerland*, which for the union of fine thought and delicate expression is almost unrivalled even among Mr. Arnold's writings, is the record of the struggle between the fascination of love and the soul which shrinks from love because it would be self-contained. The final separation which gains for the soul its bitter victory over the love that would have drawn it out of itself, is justified by the afterthought that isolation is not only a duty but a necessity ordained by God. The justification is a deep though partial truth, and is expressed in almost perfect language:—

'Yes! in the sea of life enisled,  
With echoing straits between us thrown,  
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,  
We mortal millions live alone.  
The islands feel the enclaspings flow,  
And then their endless bounds they know.'

But does it not leave the impression that to the poet the soul's instinctive longing for solitude was the first feeling, and the discovery that—

'A God, a God their severance ruled'

was the result, not the cause, of that feeling?

The proud eminence of the soul in its solitude can be rudely disturbed by the passion of human love, but both in *Switzerland* and in *Faded Leaves* the effort is not so much to quell the disturbance by giving a free course to the passion and resting upon an unselfish love, but to forget, to

efface the passion, and to preserve to the soul its calmness and self-possession. And there is singularly little about love in these poems. It would seem as if the very mention of a feeling which is essentially unselfish, at least in its first impulse, is foreign to the poet's purpose. Even when he appears to feel the influence of another soul close to his, as in *The Buried Life*, where he describes beautifully the peace of love—

‘When a beloved hand is laid in ours,  
When, jaded with the rush and glare  
Of the interminable hours,  
Our eyes can in another's eyes read clear,  
When our world-deafened ear  
Is by the tones of a loved voice caressed,’

what is to him the fruit of this, the gain of love? Still self-knowledge and self-possession—

‘The eye sinks inward, and the heart lies plain,  
And what we mean we say, and what we would, we know.’

Equally self-absorbed is Mr. Arnold when we might expect the ‘enthusiasm of humanity’ to be a reality to him. It must be owned that very little of this feeling is to be found here. There is at times a fine vision of the progress of mankind, the ultimate goal of perfection to which even now we are tending; but there is no enthusiasm in the tone, it is not to him an inspiring or a joyous theme. We must notice that Mr. Arnold is not a pessimist in the ordinary sense; he believes in progress, and, as we saw in *Obermann Once More*, he represents the new world as being even now formed from the fragments of the old. But this does not relieve his melancholy. It is belief, but not hope. What shall be in the future is not for him to share, for he is one of the past, and it is therefore no cause for rejoicing. He can endure present ills, not because he knows that they will end, but because nature and nature's works

‘Seem to bear rather than rejoice.’

And if we would learn from nature we must not look onward so much as inward, and thus

‘Yearn to the greatness of nature,  
Rally the good in the depths of thyself.’

The hope of a glorious future for the world gives him no joy because he feels so strongly the beauty and the charm of the past. He has not yet been caught up in the whirlwind of

progress, he does not yet feel the glow of the rising sun, though he has an intellectual conviction that it will rise ; and he is haunted by the recollection of what was, and cannot bear to see the world preparing to cast off the old emotions and faiths. Some of the most beautiful lines he ever wrote describe the calm after the 'epoch' has ended, before the new world breaks in with its hurry and rushing successes. These he compares to the Bacchanals breaking in upon the calm of the evening, and, called upon to admire the 'bright new age,' he can only answer—

'Ah, so the silence was !  
So was the hush.'

He feels himself neither of the new nor of the old, and in the *Grande Chartreuse* he does not wish to share their faith with 'these, last of the people who believe,' but only to shed his tears with them.

'Wandering between two worlds, one dead,  
The other powerless to be born,  
With nowhere yet to rest my head,  
Like these, on earth I wait forlorn.  
Their faith, my tears, the world deride ;  
I come to shed them at their side.'

He cannot throw himself forward into the brilliant future, nor can he feel himself at one with the past ; his isolation is complete, he cannot find anything outside himself.

It is hardly necessary to ask whether Mr. Arnold's view of religion affords him a remedy for the sadness which he feels, or whether, here also, his prevailing self-absorption does not pursue him. For we know, from other sources, to what a thin abstraction he has reduced the object of religion, and even if the 'eternal that makes for righteousness' be 'not ourselves,' yet it is not likely that so impalpable an object could draw out of itself, a soul that resists the fascination of love and the contagious ardour of human progress. But we shall find that even *Literature and Dogma* is in advance of many of his poems in asserting the existing of something external to us, which we ought to worship.

The prevailing uncertainty and hesitation in religious belief affect him with sorrow ; he looks back to the faith which 'vigorous teachers' forced him to resign, and mourns that he can no longer share it. But his sorrow arises from a different cause from that which makes many an earnest sceptic lament the clouds of doubt which darken heaven for him : to Mr. Arnold unbelief is sorrowful, not because it darkens the vision

of God within us, and covers Truth with a cloud, but because it unfits the soul for action, or indeed for contemplation, because it makes us 'fluctuate idly without term or scope.' In *The Scholar Gipsy* he describes the paralysis of faith, as it might be called; and there is no word of that which faith reveals, and doubt hides from our eyes:—

. . . . . we,  
 Light half-believers of our casual creeds,  
 Who never deeply felt, nor clearly will'd,  
 Whose insight never has borne fruit in deeds,  
 Whose vague resolves never have been fulfill'd,  
 For whom each year we see  
 Breeds new beginnings, disappointments new;  
 Who hesitate and falter life away,  
 And lose to-morrow the ground won to-day.'

These verses express well Mr. Arnold's complaint against the tendencies of our age. The vague rebuke of unbelief in the first line is diverted into a wail over the shattering effect of doubt on our own thoughts and actions; of all the charges brought against mankind in the stanza, we imagine Mr. Arnold lays most stress on the first, that 'we never deeply felt'; but none of them concern any one but ourselves, and there is no reference to a Being beyond us, nor even to the 'white Star of Truth,' which elsewhere he mentions.

But Mr. Arnold's chief statement of his philosophy of religion is in the fine poem entitled *Obermann Once More*, in which he describes the weariness and satiety of the Pagan world, the life-giving influence of Christianity poured upon it, and then the gradual waning of the faith which had given the life, and the hope of the new faith which is even now replacing it. But though here Mr. Arnold touches most closely upon the life of Christ, and the religion He founded, it is startling to find how little is said about Him, how much about our belief, and the feelings it inspired. He longs for religion, not because that in which religion trusts is true, but because religion is trust. He yearns for the ages of faith, because in them his 'ravished spirit' would also have been 'caught away,' and

'No thoughts that to the world belong  
 Had stood against the wave  
 Of love which set so deep and strong  
 From Christ's then open grave.'

The life of Christ is forgotten or passed over, not because Mr. Arnold does not believe in it, because we know that

in a certain sense he does, but because to him the importance of religion lies not in its external reality, but its sensible effect on the soul. So, a few stanzas later, we find the fact and our belief in the fact inextricably confused :—

‘And centuries came, and ran their course,  
And unspent all that time  
Still, still went forth that Child’s dear force,  
And still was at its prime.

‘Ay, ages long endured His span  
Of life, ’tis true received,  
That gracious Child, that thorn-crowned Man !  
He lived while we believed.

‘While we believed, on earth He went,  
And open stood His grave ;  
Men called from chamber, church, and tent,  
And Christ was by to save.’

Here then the highest faculty of man, the divinest thing in him, is employed in casting shadows upon the ground, and falling down and worshipping them. The inspiration and fervour of prayer is justified, not by the fact that there is One to whom we call, whether He will answer us or no, but by our belief that there is such an One. The poet would fain galvanise himself into this belief, but cannot, for

‘Now He is dead ! Far hence He lies  
In the lorn Syrian town,  
And on His grave, with shining eyes,  
The Syrian stars look down.

What we would specially remark in this poem is not that Mr. Arnold takes little account of Christ’s Person, for that is not surprising in one who cannot believe that Person to be Divine, but that he should long for faith in that very Person, and persuade himself that the whole force of Christianity was this imagined belief in what the ‘the brooding East’ had evolved from her own thought. It can only be explained by reference to that self-absorption which we have described as Mr. Arnold’s special characteristic. The truth of religion matters not, so long as we can feel the religious emotion ; when that is once passed, we must up and make to ourselves new gods which will afford us fresh emotions, and in their turn will pass and die. But the strangest thing is that the poet seems to fancy that this self-absorption, which in him leads to such results, is the teaching of Christ. The discovery of the East,

that by which she converted the Western world, in fact, the secret of Christianity, he describes thus :—

‘ “ Poor world,” she cried, “ so deep accurst !  
That runn’st from pole to pole  
To seek a draught to slake thy thirst—  
Go, seek it in thy soul ; ” ’

or, as Mr. Arnold elsewhere expresses it, in words which by their very sound might have reminded him how contrary to Christ’s real teaching they are,

‘ Resolve to be thyself ! and know, that he  
Who finds himself, loses his misery.’

We do not mean to say that Mr. Arnold’s religion is uniformly self-centred, for there are many passages which speak of a ‘ way divine,’ of an ‘ unseen Power whose eye For ever doth accompany mankind,’ of a ‘ Friend of man ; ’ but habitual reference to such a Power is not the characteristic of his poetry. And even when he does dwell upon it it is more than doubtful whether his Pantheistic tendencies do not make him regard this Power as merely the sum of the individual souls of mankind :—

‘ . . . . . we  
Myriads who live, who have lived,  
What are we all, but a mood,  
A single mood, of the life  
Of the Being in whom we exist,  
Who alone is all things in one ? ’

We may be wronging Mr. Arnold in this ; but whether Pantheism or no, there are several passages in his poems which imply the loss of personality in death, and the re-absorption of soul into the one Spirit. Yet at other times, notably in the lines to his father’s memory, the contrary is suggested.

We have quoted, perhaps, to excess from Mr. Arnold’s poems. But the thoughts which we have attempted to analyse cannot be better expressed than in Mr. Arnold’s own language. There is a vagueness about the matter, and a pellucid clearness about the form of these poems that render it almost necessary to employ little but the poet’s own words in presenting his thought. The matter is the matter, cloudy, varying, and intangible, of nineteenth century speculation : the form is Greek in its exquisite lucidity and clearness. In reading these poems we are continually met by passages in which no word is superfluous, no phrase is jarring, but that



which has to be expressed is expressed once for all. Such a stanza as

‘ But each day brings its petty dust  
Our soon-choked souls to fill,  
And we forget because we must,  
And not because we will,’

takes us back from the age of word-painting and novel combinations in language and rhythm, of superabundant epithets and darkened meaning, to the age of Pope, or of Gray, when language was studied and yet clear, artificial and yet simple. Not Mr. Tennyson’s richness of detail, not Mr. Browning’s rugged power, not Mr. Swinburne’s astonishing volume of words can afford to the jaded minds of modern readers the exquisite pleasure which is given by Mr. Arnold’s self-restrained purity of language. And if, to correspond to this, there is not the ‘sad lucidity of soul’ which he so much desires, and asserts that ‘fate’ has given to the poet, we may ascribe the want in great measure to the ‘hopeless tangle of our age,’ though partly, no doubt, it is due to the vague and unsatisfactory character of the self-possession to which he strives to attain.

We would contrast with Mr. Arnold’s tone of thought, with his hopes, his sympathies, and his beliefs, not one of the more definitely Christian poets such as Mr. Tennyson or Mr. Browning, nor one whose irreligion is as definite, such as Mr. Swinburne; but one whom Mr. Arnold would, we suppose, claim as a sympathiser in thought, and who was, indeed, much in the same perplexity and doubt, his friend, Arthur Hugh Clough.

He was one of those whose whole life was coloured by the impressions received at Oxford during the stirring years 1837-42. Not one whose faith was raised and fortified by the discussions and the personal influences of the time, but one who, as he himself expressed it, was ‘like a straw drawn up the draught of a chimney’ and afterwards left floating in the air without much of definite guidance or impulse. On first reading Clough’s poems we seem to be in an atmosphere of doubt and of little else. Two of his longer poems are entirely occupied with the vacillations of mind which beset those who are starting on life’s journey, and can see little before them but an uncertain road and a lowering sky. To one of these he has prefixed the motto ‘Il doutait de tout, même de l’amour;’ while the name of the other, *Dipsychus*, expresses the state of division and wavering which seems to

be the lot of 'feeble and restless youths born to inglorious days.' And the poet's characteristic humour, which is hardly absent from any of his poems, is not exactly a straightforward perception and enjoyment of the incongruities of life, with a consciousness all the while of the preponderating serious realities, but an irony, benevolent and natural, yet at times almost inscrutable, which makes the two sides of life seem inextricably confused. Most of his poems are concerned with the uprooting of old opinions, and share to the full the uncertainty that has invaded all provinces of thought; and his humorous irony tends to increase the appearance of utter confusion in which the world is lying. This causes the difficulty of really getting to the root of his meaning; he is not essentially dramatic like Mr. Browning, for he seldom hides himself behind the mask of another character; but the genial irony of his humour eludes at times any firm apprehension. Read such poems as the *Amours de Voyage*, and especially the section beginning

'Juxtaposition, in fine; and what is juxtaposition?'

or the song of the spirit in *Dipsychus*,

'There is no God, the wicked saith;'

or the verses headed 'Wen Gott betrügt, ist wohl betrogen,' and the difficulty of disentangling the lines, so to speak, of Clough's thought will be evident. The humour is apparent on the surface, but it is not so easy to discover how deep it goes.

Clough, then, seems to be essentially the poet of doubt; more so, at first sight, than Mr. Arnold himself. It pervades his poems, and we do not find that, like Mr. Arnold, he seeks a refuge in the calm strength and certainty of Nature, there to find the endurance so sorely needed; but he rather regards Nature as a background to the mixed and confused drama of human life, which it cannot explain nor greatly relieve. His poems are mostly of purely human interest; even those which are speculative derive their impulse from the bearing of speculation on life and duty; and to fly from mankind to seek a higher teaching or a calmer security in Nature would be foreign to Clough's instincts. Nature, indeed, is to him, as to Shakspeare or Chaucer (with whom Mr. Hutton has well compared him) an unfailing source of delight, but it is the childlike unreflecting delight of an earlier period, something of the same kind of feeling as that which he describes in the *Piper* of the reading-party, who—

'Went, in his life and the sunshine rejoicing, to Nuneham and Godstowe;

What were the claims of degree to those of life and the sunshine?'

Life and the sunshine pervade Clough's poems, but he finds no deep lessons in the external beauty that he describes so well, nor does he dwell on Nature for its own sake, but rather as the setting and accompaniment of human action. He can with genuine truth feel that

'Life is beautiful, Eustace, entrancing, enchanting to look at;  
As are the streets of a city we pace while the carriage is changing,  
As a chamber filled in with harmonious exquisite pictures,'

but it is human life that he means, and the thought is inspired by what he sees in the streets of Rome, not in the solitudes of Nature. Still, the very unself-consciousness of his love of Nature makes the feeling all the healthier and happier; there is much of the breeziness of a Scotch moor, or of the open sea, in his poems. It is a strong contrast after Mr. Arnold's cool English scenery, the river bank with its lapping wavelets and the trailing wild-flowers washed by the waters, to come upon Clough's glimpses of the burns descending to the 'great still sea,' and to feel the keen air of the salt breezes. In his two finest lyrics the chief image is taken from the sea, in the boundless expanse of which he seems to get a special inspiration, while his verse often reminds one of the freedom and motion of the waves. But we do not turn to Clough for an insight into the hidden meanings of Nature, nor for a portrayal of the calm and easily overlooked beauties of the world, as we turn to Wordsworth or to Mr. Arnold. What then is the special interest of Clough as a poet?

We have said that he seems to be the poet of doubt, and in this he apparently resembles Mr. Arnold. But it is not only in their view of Nature that the two Oxford poets differ; it is impossible to read them without being struck by the essentially different way in which the same intellectual and spiritual facts come before them. And this is especially noticeable in regard to the absorbing question of the certainty of religious truth. Mr. Arnold, as we have seen, is chiefly interested in it as affecting his own consciousness, and regrets the old faiths, and has no very joyous expectation of the future, because he is self-centred. With Clough all this is changed. There is no restless longing for a rest, which is only attainable by means of a sort of stoical endurance, but a strong, buoyant, and somewhat proud confidence in a final truth, and a determination to abide its appearance. Mr.

Arnold and Clough are both waiting for what the future shall bring forth ; but, unlike the former, Clough waits for it in cheerful hope, not without sympathy for the past, but convinced that the ultimate manifestation will be vouchsafed to man in the future. Thus the different characteristics of the two poets are best illustrated by the differing modes in which they treat an almost identical subject. Both have written short poems on the subject of the final victory of good over evil, light over darkness, but the whole tone is entirely distinct. With Mr. Arnold the central idea is that of the individual soldier baffled and at last overcome in the struggle, and falling with a sort of sullen confidence in the final victory, which, however, seems to afford but little consolation in the prospect.

‘ Creep into thy narrow bed,  
Creep, and let no more be said.  
Vain thy onset ! all stands fast !  
Thou thyself must break at last.

‘ Let the long contention cease !  
Geese are swans, and swans are geese.  
Let them have it how they will !  
Thou art tired ; best be still.

‘ They out-talked thee, hissed thee, tore thee ?  
Better men fared thus before thee !  
Fired their ringing shot and passed,  
Hotly charged—and broke at last.

‘ Charge once more, then, and be dumb !  
Let the victors, when they come,  
When the forts of folly fall,  
Find thy body by the wall.’

In Clough's poem the individual, far from being the centre, is depicted as the only hindrance to the success of the whole cause ; the strife is conceived as almost ended already, and the despondent fighter is rebuked :—

‘ Say not, the struggle nought availeth,  
The labour and the wounds are vain,  
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,  
And as things have been they remain.

‘ If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars ;  
It may be, in yon smoke concealed,  
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,  
And, but for you, possess the field.

‘ For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,  
Seem here no painful inch to gain,

Far back, through creeks and inlets making,  
Comes silent, flooding in, the main,

‘And not by eastern windows only,  
When daylight comes, comes in the light,  
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,  
But westward, look, the land is bright.’

Nothing can be finer than the two images by which he expresses the character of the struggle; the third stanza brings before us at once the whole scene of an incoming tide, with that peculiar sense of the vastness and openness of the sea which distinguishes Clough. The contrast of the whole with the bitter and sarcastic resignation of Mr. Arnold's poem; the different conceptions of the struggle itself; in the one a confused, smoke-enshrouded contest, but in the open field, in the other desperate charges against strongly-held forts; the buoyant hope of victory in the one, and the careless, hardly-mentioned belief in it in the other; all these points afford us some insight into the very distinct characteristics of the two sceptical poets. The difference goes beyond the mere superficial treatment of a subject in a few stanzas; it pervades all their poems. And the fundamental distinction that underlies this superficial unlikeness will, we think, be found to be that while it is doubtful whether Mr. Arnold really holds to, or is possessed by the idea of anything external to himself, in Clough's poems numberless passages express not only his unshaken trust in God, but the great influence which his trust has on all his nature, upon every thought and emotion. And this is the more remarkable, because he cannot define Him, or even conceive Him:—

‘I will not prate of “thus” and “so,”  
And be profane with “yes” and “no,”  
Enough that in our soul and heart  
Thou, whatsoe'er Thou may'st be, art.’

With a feeling which, to him at least, may have seemed to deserve in some measure our Lord's blessing on ‘those who have not seen, and yet have believed,’ he can exclaim—

‘Be Thou but there—in soul and heart,  
I will not ask to feel Thou art.’

It is evident that this attitude in regard to truth is very different from Mr. Arnold's emotional and subjective estimate of it. And it is an attitude which, though it must be called one of suspense, must still be distinguished from scepticism; for though Clough rejects all definitions of God that have

yet been promulgated, he does not take pride in believing in an indefinite Being, whose only attribute is to be unknowable, but his faith is in a God whom hitherto man has been unable rightly to conceive, but who assuredly will reveal Himself to us; and till He does so the poet can wait in patient confidence—

'No God, no Truth, receive it ne'er—  
Believe it ne'er—O Man!  
But turn not then to seek again  
What first the ill began;  
No God, it saith; ah, wait in faith  
God's self-completing plan;  
Receive it not, but leave it not,  
And wait it out, O Man!'

The whole of this poem, the *New Sinai*, is well worth studying, as a development of Clough's religious philosophy. God, he says, has already rebuked idolatry and polytheism by the declaration 'I am One;' He will hereafter rebuke both the new idolatries and 'the atheistic systems dark,' which have, like 'baby-thoughts,' dogged the growing man. Our duty is to wait, not in a forced endurance, but in the belief that

'Some lofty part, than which the heart  
Adopt no nobler can,  
Thou shalt receive, thou shalt believe,  
And thou shalt do, O Man!'

The human soul, then, with Clough, is not the centre of the universe, to which all truth must be brought, the object for which all truth exists, but rather one of the attendants at the shrine of truth, of small interest compared with the paramount claims of some Being external to us, who is Truth and Light. To this fact he clings, and here, diametrically opposed to Mr. Arnold, he finds relief from the confused turmoil of modern doubt and speculation:

'It fortifies my soul to know  
That though I perish, Truth is so;  
That, howsoe'er I stray and range,  
Whate'er I do, Thou dost not change.  
I steadier step when I recall  
That, if I slip, Thou dost not fall.'

If we bear in mind Clough's conviction that truth is something greater than his soul, and that there may be all the difference in the world between truth and his confused apprehension of it, we shall the better understand his relation to



Christianity as a possible form of truth. Though he cannot accept the historical facts of the Gospel, yet he is in no hurry to turn away and seek for a new religion. He is earnest in pleading for a humbler attitude of mind, and his complaint against the world is not that its scepticism has perturbed his soul's calm, but that in its hurry and carelessness it may have passed by some essential truth, and therefore he adjures his brother-men to pause:—

'The souls of now two thousand years  
Have laid up here their toils and fears,  
And all the earnings of their pain—  
Ah, yet consider it again.'

But though Clough's religious attitude is, at first sight, one of intellectual suspense, yet he does not hold truth to be perceptible to the intellect alone, or, at least, he is inclined to follow without reluctance the leadings of the emotions, even where the head cannot justify the conclusions of the heart. So in the wonderfully terse and thoughtful lines headed 'Through a glass darkly,' after suggesting as an alternative, which we know, from his whole tone of mind, he would have rejected with disdain, that we may

'for assurance sake,  
Some arbitrary judgment take,  
And wilfully pronounce it clear,  
For this or that 'tis we are here ;'

he declares that the hope which is given to us constrains in a manner our intellect:

'Ah yet, when all is thought and said,  
The heart still overrules the head ;  
Still what we hope we must believe,  
And what is given us receive ;

'Must still believe, for still we hope  
That in a world of larger scope,  
What here is faithfully begun  
Will be completed, not undone.

'My child, we still must think, when we  
That ampler life together see,  
Some true result will yet appear  
Of what we are, together, here.'

The close of these verses leads us to a further result of Clough's firm trust in some external reality, namely, his longing for 'faithful' work upon earth, his belief that genuine labour in the cause of good will have its fruit, either here or

elsewhere; and if not, why still it is work, and action is our duty. Even his hesitating heroes, who cannot for themselves decide on any course of action, can see the beauty of definite work, and he pronounces his decision for deeds done in behalf of something not ourselves, rather than for self-culture in words which he puts in the mouth of *Dipsychus*:—

‘ Ah, not for profit, not for fame,  
And not for pleasure’s giddy dream,  
And not for piping empty reeds,  
And not for colouring idle dust;  
If live we positively must,  
God’s name be blest for noble deeds.’

This, too, is the moral of the *Bothie of Tober-na-Vuolich*; that the beauty of life comes from its reality, that is, from the reality of the work which we can do on earth. But this is held without attacking culture in the one-sided way which is so common. What he rejects is the false culture which proceeds on the assumption that the object of life is to perfect oneself without regard to the work which has to be done. Some are meant for beauty, others for ‘subduing the earth and their spirit,’ and both should do their work. In spite of the longing for simplicity of life, in spite of the superficial flavour of Rousseau in this poem, it is obvious that Clough is far from rejecting either education or civilisation. The beauty of Elspie’s nature could only be really seen by one who, like Philip, had ‘the knowledge of self, and wisely instructed feeling.’ The very form of the poem, the buoyant refinement which the irregular hexameters suggest, the free Scotch life with the accompaniment of academic study and speculation, combine to give us the impression of a mind subtle yet curiously simple, vigorous, though apparently distracted by speculative hesitation. And though the abundant humour of the poem makes it not easy to be sure how far Clough was speaking his own opinions through the mouths of his *dramatis personæ*, yet both in this and in his other two long poems, *Dipsychus* and *Amours de Voyage*, we can hardly doubt that the poet has himself experienced the difficulties and questionings which he depicts. And if this be so it is remarkable how Clough, through all this wavering and cloudiness, never really loses his stand on the firm earth. In most of his speculative poems he brings us back at the close to the solid reality of life and duty, which in the earlier part he has been refining away. He does not solve the problems, but he is certain that there is a solution; and it matters not much whether he individually has the solution or not:—

' . . . And as limited beings  
 Scarcely can hope to attain upon earth to an Actual Abstract,  
 Leaving to God contemplation, to His hands knowledge confiding,  
 Sure that in us if it perish, in Him it abideth and dies not,  
 Let us in His sight accomplish our petty particular doings.'

So, confident of this, he can afford to lose himself, as it would seem, in the subtle speculations of his poems, such as those which he well describes in *The Questioning Spirit*, for they end with the thought

' I know not, I will do my duty.'

After apparently sharing fully in the doubts, and sympathising with them, he seldom fails, reverting to his secure standpoint, to rebuke the anxious intellect, and to point to that which, after all said, is unwavering and abiding. Take, for example, the fine conclusion of *The Stream of Life*:—

' O end to which our currents tend,  
 Inevitable sea,  
 To which we flow, what do we know,  
 What shall we guess of thee ?

' A roar we hear upon thy shore,  
 As we our course fulfil ;  
 Scarce we divine a sun will shine  
 And be above us still.'

Timid unbelief could hardly be more simply and forcibly rebuked ; and yet by the very form of the rebuke, ' scarce we divine,' the poet shows that he enters into the feeling, that he sympathises with the mind which is confused by the roar of the waves, though at the same time he knows and must point out that the sun is 'above us still.' For a similar return from the uncertain quagmire of sceptical rationalism to the firm ground of hope and trust, take *Epi-Straussium*, in which he accepts the worst that criticism can do, and then points to the Sun of Truth which still illumines the building, even though it has risen too high for the 'pictured panes.'

The contrast between Clough and Mr. Arnold can be carried further than the broad differences as to truth and duty. In Mr. Arnold's view of human relations we find the inevitable hopelessness which we believe to be the result of the self-centred attitude of his mind :—

' . . . . . we leave behind—  
 As, chartered by some unknown Powers,  
 We stem across the sea by night—  
 The joys which were not for our use designed,  
 The friends to whom we had no natural right,  
 The homes that were not destined to be ours.'

Clough, too, imagines separation of friends ; he also represents life as a voyage ; but what a difference in the tone ! What a buoyant motion in the very measure, as of a great ship leaping forward before a strong wind !—

‘ But, O blithe breeze ! and O great seas,  
Though ne’er, that earliest parting past,  
On your wide plain they join again,  
Together lead them home at last.

‘ One port, methought, alike they sought,  
One purpose hold where’er they fare,—  
O bounding breeze, O rushing seas !  
At last, at last unite them there !’

His thoughts instinctively turn, after he has felt the parting, to the final goal ; the tone is that of joyful hope, while Mr. Arnold ends with calm sadness, looking at the present separation and loss, and at nothing beyond.

But perhaps the strongest contrast—and with this we will conclude—is to be found in their respective treatment of love. Mr. Arnold’s we have seen ; we have seen him resisting it, reluctantly giving way to the fascination, and wrenching his soul back to its loneliness once more. To Clough it is far more of an interest than it is to his fellow-poet. Many of his poems are occupied with the discussion of love in various aspects ; and though this subject cannot escape from his subtle mind without undergoing, like all others, a process of refining away, yet generally in the end he reverts to an extremely simple, and, not conventional but, natural position ; and at times raises the mingled selfishness and self-renunciation of love into a higher sphere by means of a lofty conception of duty, in the performance of which united lives are of more avail than solitary :—

‘ Yet in the eye of life’s all-seeing sun  
We shall behold a something we have done,  
Shall of the work together we have wrought,  
Beyond our aspiration and our thought,  
Some not unworthy issue yet receive ;  
For love is fellow-service, I believe.’

Here we will conclude our examination of the deeper characteristics of these two poets. We have refrained as much as possible from criticising, in the more technical sense ; our office has been to explain and to analyse, not to judge. No doubt, analysis and explanation involve, to a certain extent, criticism also ; but we have endeavoured to refrain, when dealing with men who are undoubtedly poets, and therefore

have claims on our reverence, from that special function of modern criticism which consists in a fine perception of blemishes rather than beauties, which delights to tell its hearers not what the poet says, but what he does not say. As poetry, we will not criticise these writings ; as containing schemes of life, we will only add, in conclusion, that Mr. Arnold stands self-condemned. From the general tone of his poems it is obvious that the sadness pervading the world remains in himself, in spite of the proud self-absorption which he extols as the remedy ; and from one pathetic passage it would seem that he has at times a sense of the inconsistency between his professed object and his method, between the Pantheistic absorption into Nature at which he aims, and the studied self-culture and isolation in which he would live :—

‘ But mind—but thought—  
 If these have been the master part of us,  
 Where will *they* find their parent element ?  
 What will receive *them*, who will call *them* home ?  
 But we shall still be in them, and they in us—  
 And we shall be the strangers of the world,  
 And they will be our lords, as they are now ;  
 And keep us prisoners of our consciousness,  
 And never let us clasp and feel the All  
 But through their forms, and modes, and stifling veils.  
 And we shall be unsatisfied as now ;  
 And we shall feel the agony of thirst,  
 The ineffable longing for the life of life  
 Baffled for ever ; and still thought and mind  
 Will hurry us with them on their homeless march,  
 Over the unallied unopening earth,  
 Over the unrecognising sea.’

Self-culture cannot give us a religion ; not even the religion of Pantheism. And when we turn to Clough, we find that it is precisely in proportion as he feels himself able to cling to somewhat external to him that he is hopeful, energetic, and religious. Would it not therefore seem that, if these poets be representatives of our age, no teaching can satisfy it but that which will give it something external and objective wherein to rest ; that no merely emotional, introspective religion will loose the chains which bind us, for they are the chains of self ; but that now, as of old, it is only the Truth that can make us free ?

# ART. V.—THE INFLUENCE OF SAVONAROLA IN ART.

1. *Sermoni e Prediche di Fra Girolamo Savonarola de' Predicatori.* (Prato, 1876-7.)
2. *Opus perutile de Divisione ac Utilitate omnium Scientiarum.* FRA GIROLAMO SAVONAROLA, Ord. Pred. (Venetiis, 1542.)
3. *Delle Vite de' più eccellenti Pittori, Scultori e Architettori.* GIORGIO VASARI.
4. *De l'Art Chrétien.* A. F. RIO.
5. *Girolamo Savonarola: His Life and Times.* By PASQUALE VILLARI. Translated from the Italian by LEONARD HORNER, F.R.S.
6. *The Makers of Florence.* By Mrs. OLIPHANT. (1876.)

DURING so many ages Savonarola has been denounced as the foe to art and culture, the opponent of that representative of the Renaissance, Lorenzo de' Medici, that to many, the title of this paper may appear at first sight strange. Even this century, which more than any other has done justice to the great Dominican friar, has been unable altogether to divest itself of this preconceived idea, and we still occasionally hear Savonarola spoken of as the fanatic preacher to whom art was an accursed thing, and at whose bidding pictures and statues were indiscriminately thrust into the flames. Much of this erroneous impression doubtless arises from the fact that Vasari, whose biographies still constitute the chief material from which Italian art-history is derived, was himself a partisan of the Medici, and, therefore, the natural enemy of the Piagnoni, or mourners, as the followers of the Friar were contemptuously termed. Living in times immediately following those of Savonarola, Vasari saw in Fra Girolamo only the barbarian foe to the Renaissance, and accordingly his language in speaking of *the sect* is uniformly cold and bitter. Other writers followed in his steps, and thus the Friar of S. Marco was held up to posterity as a fanatic and iconoclast. The first to vindicate Savonarola, and show a just appreciation of his character and aims, was M. Rio, who, in his *Art Chrétien*, gave the world an eloquent panegyric of the Domi-



nican reformer. Unfortunately, the ardour of this accomplished writer's enthusiasm carried him somewhat beyond the strict limits of truth. Not content with vindicating Savonarola from the charge of Puritanism, he asserted for him the position of a founder of a school of Christian painting as opposed to the pagan realism of the Renaissance, a claim which the testimony of facts is unable to support. Since then much has been written upon Savonarola. History and fiction have alike been busy with his name. The painstaking researches of Professor Villari first placed him in his true light before the world. And now Mrs. Oliphant, than whom no one has written better of the prophet of Florence, has shown a just appreciation of Savonarola's position with regard to art by devoting a chapter of her last work to the Piagnoni painters. It is only to be regretted that the scope of her work did not admit of a fuller consideration of the whole question.

For, although Savonarola was not the founder or restorer of the Christian art which in its earliest simplicity had belonged to a past age, he never by word or act sought to discourage the practice of art or banish anything that is beautiful out of life. This we think no one who has studied his sermons and writings fairly, can dispute, and if no other testimony were to be had, the very names of the artists who were his devoted followers should be enough to defend him from these charges. Yet further, not only did he recognise the place of art as a moral force in the world, but by the vigour of his words, by the reality of his whole life, he gave a fresh impulse to art in all its manifold branches, and left an abiding impression upon the painters and sculptors of his day.

The one great end of Savonarola's life, the motive which supplies the key to all, was the glory of God and the advancement of His Kingdom upon earth. It is this very single-mindedness which, Mrs. Oliphant has justly remarked, constitutes a difficulty in the eyes of his modern biographers. Nineteenth-century critics, with refined perceptions and love of complication, are puzzled with the simplicity of a character of which the ground-work is simply faith in the unseen. Lower motives must be found, or if not to be found, invented, to account for so powerful an influence. Yet it is this very singleness of purpose that can alone afford the true reading of his life. Without it we may discover indeed a grand and striking figure surrounded by the utmost picturesqueness of incident, but we shall fail to seize the real meaning, the completeness and unity of his marvellous character. 'My aims have been few and great,' he said, when his enemies tortured

him again and again, and strove to lay bare the inmost recesses of his heart; and he never spoke a truer word. From the day when in Ferrara, among all the brilliant festivities of the court of the Estes, struck with a terrible sense of the utter vanity of life and the corruption of all around him, he fled to the cloister to seek in the profession of the Dominican Order what seemed the only means of saving his Church and country, the kingdom of God was never absent from his heart, and seldom from his lips. To restore Christian faith and practice in all its early simplicity and purity, became the purpose of his life, the goal to which all his efforts were directed.

Whether in the solitude of the cell, or the wider arena of the Duomo, this was the one point in which all his aims converged—'*Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.*' To deliver Florence from the yoke of tyrants, to reform manners, even to realise that most splendid dream which has ever swelled the breast of man with longing, the foundation of a republic of Christian men governed by Christian principles, owning no master but Christ, these were high objects, dearer to him than life; and yet these came but second, for Christ and His glory were what he sought above all. So it was that he looked upon life. With this singleness of purpose, he regarded all the varied interests, the complex passions that make up other men's scheme of existence. Only so far as they led to Christ and hastened His kingdom, were they worth considering. If he treated of philosophy, it was to point out how faith, grounded upon the laws of reason, is the one supreme science that leads men up to the Beatific Vision; if he spoke of beauty it was only to remind his hearers of that unseen hidden One, Who is the source of all beauty, the end of all desire. '*Vuoi tu aver pace? Guarda solamente un solo e amalo, cioè Dio.*' 'Wouldst thou find peace? Look to One alone and love Him—that is God.' In these oft-repeated words we have the summary of his teaching and the explanation of his life.

But, because this was the absorbing passion of his soul, grasped and held fast with all the rare intensity of his nature, it would be wrong to infer that he was, therefore, blind or dull to the fair sights and pleasant voices that gladden the sadness of our earthly exile. Like all the finest spirits, Savonarola was keenly alive to outward impressions, to none more so than to those of painting, of poetry, and of music. In his father's house at Ferrara he had received a liberal education in all the learning of the day. It was in music and

poetry, in playing on the lute in the loneliness of his chamber, in composing a dirge on the vanity of earthly things—*De ruina mundi* is the title of the poem—that his world-weariness found its first expression. And when, in the early days of his monastic life, he imposed upon himself the stern obligation of sacrificing whatever he loved best, Burlamacchi tells us that it cost him more than all to put away the illuminated missals and pictures of his choice. Still, however severe his rule might be towards himself, he never sought to banish art from the convent. It was his ambition to make the monastery a school of Christian art, and under his rule S. Marco, which had already been the home of more painters than one, became the workshop and meeting-place of the first artists of the day.

In his teaching there was nothing of narrow jealousy or cold exclusiveness. Whatever things were lovely, whatever of good report, found a place in his ideal republic. But it was with this reservation. Art must be kept to its first and highest use, to set forth God's truth, and to lead men to His Throne; and therefore art, like all else, must be reformed. Again and again he rebukes the painters of Florence for degrading their God-given art to base uses, not only allowing it to be infected by that paganism which under Lorenzo had overgrown the holiest things and crept into the most sacred places, but making it actually minister to sin by the subjects they represented.

In Savonarola's days the art of Giotto and Angelico, while advancing to technical perfection and recovering forgotten beauty of form from the study of the antique, was fast losing its early purity and devotional feeling. A fashion had sprung up of introducing the portraits of mistresses of men of note and other women of scandalous lives into altar-pieces and frescoes on the walls of churches, as saints and madonnas. The greatest painters sanctioned this practice by their example, as, for instance, in the choir of S. Maria Novello, we find Ginevra de' Benci, a celebrated beauty of Lorenzo's court, in Ghirlandajo's fresco of S. John the Baptist's birth. Profane and curious persons—they are Savonarola's own words—might be seen on feast-days crowding round some altar to recognise in a newly-uncovered madonna the features of some woman of notoriously evil fame; while the licence to which painters abandoned themselves in the oratories of private houses and palaces was even worse. Against this profanation of art Savonarola lifted up his voice repeatedly from the pulpit.

'We find young men going about,' he says, indignantly, in a Lenten sermon, 'saying to this person and to that—"She is a very Magdalene," or "He is a true S. John," or "She is an

image of the Virgin," and then you place their portraits in our churches, to the great scandal of things divine. In this, you painters, you do much mischief; and if you knew, as well as I do, how great that mischief is, you would not be guilty of it.' And further: 'You set up all your vanities in the churches. Do you believe that the Virgin went about dressed as you represent her? I tell you that she went about clothed as a humble young woman.' The true use of art, he tells these painters of Florence again and again, is to be the handmaid of the Church, lending her aid to inculcate with fresh force the teaching of Christ. 'You see such and such a saint represented in that church, and you go and say, "I too will lead a good life, and become like unto him."'

With the women of his congregation he is yet more plain-spoken on the subject. Their idea of beauty is altogether false, mistaken. They imagine that by adorning themselves with gold and jewels, by seeking the help of rouge, powder of Cyprus, and the like, they increase their beauty. Savonarola can tell them this is all wrong.

'Ye women, who glory in your ornaments, your head-dresses, your hands, I tell you that you are all ugly! Would you see true beauty? Observe a devout person, man or woman, in whom the Spirit dwells: observe such an one, I say, while in the act of prayer, when the countenance is suffused with divine beauty, and the prayer is over. You will then see the beauty of God reflected in that face, and a countenance almost angelic. . . . The reason is this: the pure soul partakes of the beauty of God. We are told of the Virgin, that so great was her beauty men stood stupefied before her; and yet so great was the sanctity reflected from her, that in no one who gazed upon her ever entered an evil thought, but all held her in reverence. . . . Look at the sun and the stars—their beauty is in light; behold the spirits of the blessed—light constitutes their beauty; raise your thoughts to the Almighty—He is light and beauty itself! Therefore the beauty of man and woman is greater and more perfect the nearer it approaches to the primary beauty.'<sup>1</sup>

Savonarola sought to apply the same principle to the sister arts. Street-singing had always been popular in Florence, and in Lorenzo's time the *Canti Carnialeschi*, or Carnival songs, which the young men sang over their midnight orgies, had become of a pagan and often profligate character. To replace these by songs of a religious tendency he himself wrote sacred lauds, which the children of Florence, under the training of his assistant Fra Domenico, sang through the streets at carnival time in a procession numbering as many as ten

<sup>1</sup> Sermon xxviii. on Ezekiel, Lent, 1496.

thousand. These lauds, with other *canzoni*, written mostly in Savonarola's younger days, have been collected and published in a volume by M. Audin di Rians, and although most of them make no pretension to beauty of form, occasionally the fervour of feeling breaks forth into flashes of true poetry. The 'Lauda al Crocifisso'—beginning 'Jesù, sommo conforto,' compares not unfavourably even with the hymns of Bernard, while there is grace as well as elevation of thought in lines such as the following:—

'Quando il soave e mio fido conforto,  
Per la pietà della mia stanca vita,  
Con la sua dolce citara fornita  
Mi trae dall' onde al suo beato porto.'<sup>1</sup>

In these compositions Savonarola at once gave an example of the foremost use to which he would apply poetry, and denied the assertions of those who accused him of condemning all verse alike. For already, in his own lifetime, the strong expressions in which he denounced the licentious poets of the day in his sermons drew upon him the reproach—no mean one in Florence at that time—of being an enemy to poets and poetry.

So heavy did this charge appear to a learned friend of his, Ugolino Verino, that he wrote to Savonarola, urging him to defend himself in this respect, and it is to this appeal that we owe his treatise 'In Apology of Poetry,' contained in the larger work, *On the Utility of all the Sciences*, and which, taken as an expression of his sentiments with regard to æsthetics in general, is most interesting. There is a smile at the bare idea

<sup>1</sup> Another very characteristic specimen is the laud written for popular use the year the new Government was established by Savonarola's influence. We give the first two verses:—

'Viva, viva in nostro core  
Cristo rè, duce e signore!  
Ciascun purghi l'intelletto,  
La memoria e voluntade,  
Del terrestre e vano affetto;  
Arda tutto in caritate,  
Contemplando la bontade  
Di Jesù, rè di Fiorenza;  
Con digiuni e penitenza  
Si riformi dentro e fore.  
Se volete Jesù regni  
Per sua grazia in vostro core,  
Tutti gli odii e pravi sdegni  
Commutate in dolce amore;  
Discacciando ogni rancore,  
Ciascun prenda in se la pace;  
Questo è quel che a Gesù piace  
Sù nel Cielo e qui nel core.'

of his ever having condemned poetry. 'It never entered into my mind to condemn the art of poetry, but its abuses. Many have calumniated me on that account, and the truth is I had made up my mind to pay no regard to the calumnies, but follow the saying which tells us not to answer a fool with his folly; but what Verino says has induced me to take up my pen.' After defining poetry and its uses, and pointing out the true poetry of the Scriptures, he proceeds to blame the poets of his own time for their servile imitation of the ancients, above all for returning to seek inspiration at the dried-up springs of a false and pedantic Hellenism, when a larger hope of which the old world knew nothing had dawned upon the horizon of man's vision. But although he severely reproves the use of licentious poetry which might contaminate the young, and reminds his hearers that their beloved Plato would have banished such poets, he can admire those of the ancients who wrote of great and noble actions. 'Such writers,' he says, 'turned poetry to good account, and I neither can nor ought to say one word against them.'

That Savonarola frequently used strong expressions with regard to pagan learning is doubtless true. He can scarcely contain himself in denouncing the fashion of filling sermons with long Greek and Latin quotations, and of bringing Plato to the front on every occasion, and occasionally in the heat of argument his zeal oversteps the bounds of temperance. But we must remember the state of Florence, of society, and of the Church at that time. Perhaps never since the last days of the Roman empire were faith and morals at a lower ebb. The material prosperity of the Florentines had increased enormously in the last three centuries; the luxury of the upper class of citizens had risen to an extravagant pitch, and all experience shows that a luxurious is always a sceptical age. When those who call themselves Christians live for the things of this world, and are content with a formal and hollow outward profession, earnest minds begin to doubt the truth of Christ's words. Love grown cold, faith is sure to die.

And then, upon this fifteenth century, the Renaissance had broken with all its dazzling heritage of past days, with the wonders of Greek form, with the long-lost treasures of ancient learning.

'No more, as once in sunny Avignon,  
The poet-scholar spreads the Homeric page  
And gazes sadly, like the deaf at song;  
For now the old epic voices ring again,  
And vibrate with the beat and melody  
Stirred by the warmth of old Ionian days.'



All this had come to the children of that generation. Men turned to Greece and Rome to satisfy the yearning of their hearts, and found better consolation in honest paganism than in a false Christianity. Elegant scholarship was a fashion, nay, more—a bondage enslaving thought in the fetters of servile imitation. The collection of ancient manuscripts was held to be the highest occupation of a lifetime; Plato was the god of society; even in the cloister monks gave up the study of the Scriptures, because they feared to spoil their Latinity; and a Dominican of S. Marco could ask his Prior what was the use of recalling the words of ignorant fishermen like the Apostles. So entirely had paganism invaded all educated life, that it was thought necessary to receive a Pope with a procession of heathen deities. Worst of all, the most refined culture went everywhere hand in hand with the grossest licentiousness, and the highest places of the Church furnished the most fearful examples of corruption and profligacy.

It was to this that Savonarola came. All this he saw, daily, hourly, around him. 'I could not support the enormous wickedness of the people in Italy. Everywhere virtue is despised, vice in honour,' he wrote, when at twenty-two he left his father's house for the convent. Can we wonder if his generous soul bursts at times into fiery indignation as he looked upon a society penetrated to the core with paganism? 'Believe,' he cries, 'in the sufficiency of the word of God, in the knowledge of Christ, which can be attained without the help of all this vain learning. Let Homer, let Virgil be studied, by all means, but let not the Bible be thrown aside. Have your Plato if you will, but have Christ too.' Especially was he anxious that the Scriptures and Fathers should be taught in the schools, in order that the young might learn Christian truth as well as Greek and Latin; and we find him giving a foremost place to S. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*—that work which must have been to him as a foreshadowing of his own cherished dream, the setting up on earth of the ideal realm, the City of God, where Christ was King. The history of saints and martyrs should also be taught the young, that they might early learn to follow these great examples, he says, but above all the story of the life of Christ. Thus it is with each successive aspect of Savonarola's teaching, in politics, in art, in education; it is Christ he seeks as the aim and end of all. If he closed his eyes to anything of mortal beauty, it was because he feared its earth-born mists might dim the vision of the King; if he bade men turn away from Plato, it was because for Plato Christ had been forgotten.

It is in this light that we must consider that one act which, more than any other, has brought reproach upon the head of Savonarola—the famous Bonfire of Vanities.

The story, in all its picturesqueness of incident, is familiar to most of us. We remember, almost as though we ourselves had seen them, the processions of white-robed children with red crosses and olive branches going from house to house all that carnival time, to ask for the *anathema* or *vanities*, and then that strange scene on the Piazza, when, on the last day of carnival, the great pyramids of vanities, including masks, rouge-pots, cards, immoral books and pictures, were erected and solemnly set fire to, in the presence of assembled multitudes. Much has been written concerning this supposed wanton destruction of valuable objects, and many a lamentation poured out over the precious manuscripts, the treasures of art and learning that perished in the flames. Friends and foes alike have helped to magnify its importance, but it is impossible to prove that anything of real value was lost, excepting, it may be, those early studies from pagan models which the young painter Baccio della Porta, with Lorenzo di Credi, and other devout *piagnoni* artists, flung into the flames. All Guicciardini tells us is that carnival dresses, most likely the chief part of the bonfire, dice, cards, sinful pictures and books, were burnt on that occasion. However this may be, it is easy to understand the motive on which Savonarola acted.

It is the general rule alike in the history of individuals and of nations, that when a great apostasy is followed by a revival of religion, the moment of conversion is signalised by some striking act, some violent wrench, as it were, by which the past is broken with and a proof of changed heart given. So in this case with Savonarola. He felt that a solemn protest against sin and paganism was necessary, some visible act by which Florence in turning to God might deliberately and publicly renounce the evil thing. That Savonarola gloried in the act is plain. Without doubt he triumphed in the thought that Florence had put away the outward signs of sin, as he poured out the fulness of his heart in the words of his own laud—‘O sopra ogni città felice:’

*‘O city blessed above all others! Florence loved and chosen of Christ, city of God whence His splendour breaks to go forth into all worlds, to whose lilies pilgrims should come from afar!’*

But even then a shadow of fear crossed his mind, a fear lest this revived earnestness should be merely external, and we find him telling the people in his next sermons that there

had been a little too much shouting of *Viva Cristo!* and they must remember that to lead Christian lives was far better than all the singing and shouting and crowding to hear sermons.

While we speak of the Bonfire of Vanities, the head and front of all Savonarola's offending in the eyes of scholars and art-historians, it is only fair to recall that other act which should have earned him the eternal gratitude of all the students and lovers of antiquity. When in 1495 the property of the Medici was confiscated by the State upon Piero de' Medici's banishment, the library which Cosimo and Lorenzo had spared no pains or expense to collect was, by Savonarola's influence, purchased by the convent of S. Marco for the sum of 3,000 florins. The friar thus conferred a twofold benefit on the cause of learning by saving this noble collection of manuscripts from dispersion, and placing it in the convent library, the only one then open to the public in Italy; and thus it is to Savonarola that Florence owes the preservation within her walls of the Laurentian Library, still her boast and pride.

It is now time to turn from Savonarola's theories and teaching with regard to art and culture, to those distinguished men among his followers who by their lives and works bore the best witness to the 'faith of the friar.' When we come to estimate the forces that govern mankind, we find that ideas embodied in human action cannot fail to leave their stamp upon other men. The influence that a man acquires will be great in proportion to the greatness of the idea which inspires him, and the completeness with which he renders that idea in his life. We know Savonarola's lofty aim, we have seen his intensity, his high courage and stedfast resolution in pursuing it; and we cannot wonder that his influence on the men of his generation proved immense, almost unparalleled.

It is perhaps scarcely possible for us to realise the effect of those sermons of Savonarola during those eight years that he held the ear of the fickle Florentines. People got up in the middle of the night to get places for the sermon, and stood waiting in cold and wet at the cathedral doors, noble ladies came in from their country villas, men of all ranks and ages crowded to that vast Duomo, 'with as much jubilee and rejoicing,' says Burlamacchi, 'as if they were going to a wedding.' Then the silence was great in the church, and though many thousand people were thus collected together, no sound was to be heard, not even a "hush," until the arrival of the children, who sang hymns with so much sweetness that heaven seemed to have opened. Thus they waited three or four hours till the *padre* entered the pulpit,

and the attention of so great a mass of people, all with eyes and ears intent upon the preacher, was wonderful; which he brought about in Florence excited the wonder of all contemporaries. The luxurious banqueting, the stone-throwing and revelry in the streets were given up; altars were erected at every corner on feast days, the shops were shut, and people flocked to church. Merchants and bankers restored ill-gotten gains, high-born women gave their jewels in alms and exchanged their costly dress for the simplest attire, the 'Veni Creator' and 'Ave Maris Stella' were heard in the streets instead of Lorenzo's profane and pagan songs, and in the midday hour of rest tradesmen might be seen studying their Bibles in their shops. 'Neither in our own age, nor in those of our fathers and grandfathers,' writes the cool clear-headed Guicciardini, certainly no *piagnone*, far less a fanatic, 'has an ecclesiastic enjoyed so great a degree of authority, in a city where other preachers of high repute were never listened to for more than two or three seasons.'<sup>1</sup> So great was the number of those who came to take the Dominican habit that S. Marco was unable to contain them, and the Government had to lend the convent the adjoining building of La Sapienza.

Not only young enthusiastic spirits, but men of mature age and great learning, canons of the cathedral, poets and Hellenists who had been friends of Lorenzo and members of his Academy, ended their days in S. Marco, at Savonarola's feet. The founder of the Academy himself, Marsilio Ficino, was one of the friar's hearers and admirers; Angelo Politian, the representative of Lorenzo's court, asked to be buried in Dominican garb and laid in S. Marco, where he sleeps side by side with the great scholar Pico della Mirandola. This prince, the Phoenix of his day, who united a noble and graceful presence with a marvellous erudition, was one of the first to discover Savonarola's merit, and after being instrumental in bringing him to Florence, remained his intimate friend till his own death in the year 1494, at the early age of thirty-two. But it is with the sculptors and painters of Florence who became followers of Savonarola that we have to do. These, more than any other class, responded to his awakening call, and among them we find many of his most devoted adherents.

<sup>1</sup> *Opere Inedite.*

Foremost among them is one whose name can never be separated from that of Savonarola, the young painter Baccio della Porta—as he was called from the vicinity of his father's dwelling to the gate of San Pier Gattolini—better known by his monastic name of Fra Bartolommeo.

By birth the son of a muleteer, Baccio was early placed in the shop of Cosimo Rosselli, under whose teaching he rapidly outstripped his fellow-pupils. His gentle and amiable character won the affections of all, and in his master's shop he formed a friendship, which lasted to the end of his life, with another young artist, Mariotto Albertinelli. The two, we are told by Vasari, were 'as one body and one soul.' The friends, however, were of a very different order of mind, for while the careless pleasure-loving Mariotto preferred the Medici gardens and the gay company he found there, Baccio sought his inspiration in the silence of the Church of the Carmine, and studied the frescoes of Masaccio.

The same tastes which took him there would naturally prompt him to be one of the crowd which hung upon the lips of the eloquent Dominican, and we can easily understand the effect such a preacher's voice would have upon the impressionable nature of the young painter just entering into life. It came to him like a new revelation, telling him of a higher existence, undreamt of by the multitude, a great cause which demanded all the energies of his being, the consecration of his unfolding powers, a wide-reaching unending hope. Baccio heard and did not hesitate. Heart and soul he threw himself into the cause of Christ and the Frate to lead the ideal life which Savonarola held up in all its severity of perfection in the eyes of this corrupt and luxurious age. While Mariotto scoffed at monks and friars, Baccio became the devoted follower and intimate friend of the Friar of S. Marco. Almost the only one of his early works extant is a portrait of Savonarola, which, after being in the first place sent to Ferrara, was brought back to Florence, and lately passed from private hands into the convent of S. Marco, where it now remains in the cell that was once the Frate's. This fine portrait, probably the most faithful representation of Savonarola we possess, agrees exactly with contemporary descriptions. We have the powerful head, rugged in outline, but not without a certain grandeur, the piercing eyes gleaming from under the cowl with the same fire with which they flashed upon the listening multitudes in the vast cathedral, while below is the old inscription, but recently recovered from under the coat of paint which hid the words in days of perse-

cution: '*Hieronymi Ferrariensis missi à Deo prophetæ effigies.*' We find Baccio present in all the chief scenes of the great revival. Foremost among other artists, he flung his early pagan studies into the Bonfire of Vanities at that memorable carnival, and on the fatal day when the convent was stormed, and the enemies of Savonarola triumphed, he was at S. Marco in the midst of the fighting.<sup>1</sup>

The terrible events which followed, the utter failure that seemed to close upon the cause he had held to be that of Christ, fell upon the young painter with crushing force. A sense of bitter despair overwhelmed him. With Savonarola's death it seemed as if all hope in life, all faith in man, had perished. For a time he struggled to paint on. In the remains of the 'Last Judgment' which the traveller still finds on the ruined walls of S. Maria Nuova, we see how in that dark hour Baccio clung with despairing grasp to those eternal realities first fully made clear to him by Savonarola, and which, now the master's voice was silenced, were all he had left to trust in. But the task was beyond his strength. Before the end of the year 1499, he threw up all his commissions, left the unfinished fresco at S. Maria Nuova to be completed by Albertinelli, and to the grief of all his friends took the vows of the Dominican Order at Prato.

During six years he lived in the seclusion of the cloister, finding rest and balm for his crushed spirit in the exercise of devotion within those very walls which his beloved master had hallowed with his presence, and without, so far as we know, a thought of returning to his easel. At the end of that time, however, a longing for the old art, perhaps first revived by his intercourse with Raphael, came over him; he again took up his brush, no longer to work for his own gain, but for the glory of God and the advantage of his community, and, with his old friend Mariotto as a partner, made the workshop of S. Marco famous. To this later period it is that all Fra Bartolommeo's chief works belong, and thus in ceaseless activity he spent the remainder of his life, until he died of a fever in 1517, and was buried in S. Marco, the home and centre of his dearest memories. To the last, the thought of Savonarola was with him, and we find him in his latter years,

<sup>1</sup> Vasari accuses Baccio of cowardice on this occasion, but it must be remembered that he bears no good-will to the *piagnoni*, and that many of his assertions have been proved to be groundless. If Baccio did not fight, it was only in obedience to the commands of Savonarola, who both ordered and implored his partisans to lay down their arms.



when spending a few weeks in the country hospital of Pian di Mugnone, recalling the old passionate days to picture forth once more the features of the great Frate, this time as S. Pietro Martire, in the well-known Dominican mantle with the sign of martyrdom upon his brow.

Close around Fra Bartolommeo cluster a group of humbler names who shared in his devotion to Savonarola, and, like him, belonged to the Dominican Order. In the long list of Florentines who took the vows at S. Marco in Savonarola's lifetime, we find painters, sculptors, miniaturists in numbers. We will only mention Fra Eustachio, the gentle artist who loved the study of Dante and knew his poem by heart, Ambrogio della Robbia, the gifted inheritor of a name illustrious in art, to whom we owe a noble terra-cotta head of Savonarola, and Fra Benedetto, whose conversion was one of the most striking of all. As the miniature painter Bettuccio, he led a dissolute life, until one day a noble matron induced him to hear the friar, who was the talk of all Florence. From that moment the young man, smitten with remorse, knew no peace until he had thrown himself at the Frate's feet, and although for some time Savonarola would not admit him to the Dominican Order, and Bettuccio wavered between the paths of holiness and a return to his former life, he ultimately entered S. Marco, and under the name of Fra Benedetto proved one of the most zealous and faithful of the brethren. On the night of the attack, Fra Benedetto fought as an ardent defender of S. Marco, and drew upon himself a gentle rebuke for wearing arms from Savonarola. Afterwards he survived to beguile the hours of a cruel captivity and console himself for the loss of his dear master, in the composition of the poem, 'Cedrus Libani,' which still remains one of the most complete and authentic accounts of Savonarola and his convent.

From these artists of S. Marco we pass on to those who, while they retained their secular calling, were permanently impressed by the teaching of Savonarola. Chief among these is Lorenzo di Credi, with whose 'Holy Families' and circular pictures of the Nativity we are all familiar. The favourite pupil of Verrocchio, Credi grew up in his shop with Perugino and Lionardo da Vinci, and by his patient and laborious industry attained a high place among contemporary artists. His character is well expressed in the grave gentleness and simplicity of the kneeling madonnas so frequent in his works, and in the conscientious pains and finish bestowed upon every part of the picture, which made Vasari exclaim that 'such diligence was not more justifiable than the greatest neglect.'

His natural piety and sincerity drew him early within the influence of the Friar of San Marco; 'he became,' says Vasari, 'very partial to the sect of Fra Girolamo, and always led a good and honest life.' Like Baccio della Porta, he laid his pagan studies on the pyre of the Bonfire of Vanities, and confined himself exclusively to the representation of sacred subjects. The high position he held in Florence as an experienced artist probably saved him from the persecution that befel most of the *piagnoni* in 1498. He survived the catastrophe of that Palm-Sunday almost forty years; but it is interesting to find that he still remained intimate with the principal *piagnoni*, and did not separate his lot from his old friends of S. Marco. Along with Corniol the engraver, another warm partisan of Savonarola, he witnessed the will of the architect Cronaca, and the last six years of his life were spent in honourable retirement in the hospital of S. Maria Nuova, where Baccio della Porta painted his 'Last Judgment,' and in an apparently close connexion with the artists of S. Marco.

With regard to Credi's friend Lionardo, he had left Florence for Milan long before Savonarola commenced his preaching; but that once at least he must have returned there, and have been actually brought into contact with the friar, is proved by his presence at the meeting of architects called by Savonarola's influence to form plans for the erection of a hall capable of containing the Great Council he advocated in his scheme for a popular form of government. At this meeting, besides Lionardo, Michael Angelo, Baccio d'Agnolo, Giulano da S. Gallo, and Cronaca were all present, and the execution of the plans agreed upon was ultimately given to Cronaca, as much on account of his well-known friendship for Savonarola and interest in the popular cause, as for his skill as an architect. The real name of this distinguished architect and faithful follower of Savonarola was Simone Pollaiuolo. At an early age he went to Rome with his uncle, the architect Antonio Pollaiuolo, and on his return to Florence astonished all his companions with his stories of the wonders of the Eternal City, from which, says Vasari, he obtained the nickname of Cronaca. Still in the streets of Florence, churches and palaces, on the classic model which Cronaca loved, attest the talent and industry of the brave and honest man who was the first architect of his day. In the Via Tornabuoni his noble Palazzo Strozzi meets the eye, its massive walls of rough-hewn stone and beautiful ironwork standing out above the heap of blossoms, sheaves of lily of the valley, roses, narcissus, which the flower-girls sell on the stone bench beneath—

'flowers,' says a writer of the day, 'that seem scarcely more evanescent than the crowd of men and women who have bloomed and passed, and gone into darkness while the old wall has stood fast, without getting so much as a wrinkle or line chiselled by age upon its rugged stones.'

On the hill of S. Miniato, too, embosomed in ancient cypresses, and looking down on the towers and bridges of Florence and fair Val d'Arno beyond, is the convent-church that Cronaca designed for the monks of S. Salvatore, and that Michael Angelo loved to call his '*bella villanella*.'

The Council Hall in the Old Palace which it was Cronaca's pride to rear, and whose admirable proportions excited Vasari's wonder as much as the extraordinary haste with which it was built, has unfortunately undergone too much alteration to be a fair test of his powers, but there is a strange poetic justice in the fact, to which Mrs. Oliphant draws our attention, that within its walls a greater council than that of Savonarola's calling—the first Italian Parliament—met four hundred years afterwards.

Cronaca lived till 1509, held in high reputation by all Florence, but not forgetful of his *piagnoni* friends or of the past in which he had played a prominent part. That devotion to Savonarola which had characterised his life, remained the distinguishing feature of his latter days. In proportion as the end drew near and the things of earth faded from his sight, the great realities of which the friar had spoken, and for which he had laid down his life, gained in clearness and steadfastness. 'In the last years of his life,' says Vasari, in his contemptuous way, 'there entered into his head so great a frenzy for the Frate Girolamo Savonarola, that he could talk of nothing else but him, his words and actions.'

As architecture was represented at S. Marco by Cronaca, so Baccio di Montelupo figures among Savonarola's followers as the votary of sculpture. Converted by the preaching of the friar, like Fra Benedetto, from a life of pleasure and idleness, he became a zealous *piagnone*, and adorned S. Marco with crucifixes of his workmanship. A large one hung in the choir of the convent church in Vasari's days, and another which belonged to Savonarola may still be seen side by side with Fra Bartolommeo's portrait, in the cell where he lived. A more important work is the noble statue of S. John the Evangelist on the exterior of the church Or' San Michele, converted into its present form from a granary. After the death of Savonarola, Montelupo was too deeply implicated in the eyes of the *Arrabbiati* to escape persecution. He was

forced to fly from Florence, and paid for his attachment to the Frate by years of exile. In April 1508, Fra Bartolommeo found him at Venice, and there the two artists renewed the friendship of old days, and while they together visited the art treasures of the sea-girt city, recalled that other *bell' ovile* where in brighter times they had both grown up in the shelter of S. Marco.

We must not forget the skilled engraver Giovanni delle Corniole, the friend of Cronaca, of Credi, and Sandro Botticelli, to whose hand we owe the likeness of Savonarola which is one of the finest of modern gems. It is now in the Uffizzi, and bears the inscription, '*Hieronymus Ferrariensis ord. Pred. propheta et martyr.*' Nor should we omit the miniaturists Monte di Giovanni and Gherardo. Brothers by birth and profession, they worked together for years in the illumination of the missals of the Duomo, and other books at S. Maria Nuova, of which hospital Gherardo was organist. Again and again in these works the portrait of Savonarola is introduced, especially by Monte di Giovanni, who, living till a great age, consoled himself for the triumph of the friar's enemies by reproducing the likeness of his beloved teacher in different disguises at every page, and when required to perpetuate the memory of Leo X.'s visit to Florence in the choir of the cathedral, dared to paint Savonarola's portrait in pontifical robes and mitre. They were employed on a more important task when in the days of Savonarola's greatness they worked on the mosaics of S. Zenobius' Chapel in the cathedral. On this occasion they were associated with no less a personage than Sandro Botticelli. It is perhaps not generally known that this last-named painter, the favourite of a modern school of thought which has sought its chief inspiration in that paganism against which Savonarola preached, was a zealous *piagnone* and devoted follower of the Friar of S. Marco, 'obstinately attached to that party.'

Within the last few years a passion for Botticelli has seized hold of artistic circles. Those madonnas with drooping eyelids and tender melancholy, those angels quiring in their celestial harmonies, who still wear a touch of earthly sadness on their faces, as if even there they could not forget the sin and sorrow of mortals, appeal in their warm human sympathies to many who cannot rise to the heights of Perugino or Raphael's untroubled calm, and who stand unmoved before the all-heavenly dreams of Angelico. There is indeed about

<sup>1</sup> Vasari, *Life of Sandro Botticelli*.

this man's pictures a fascination hard to describe. We gaze and gaze and wonder what this painter could have been whose art thus fathomed the weary mysteries of humanity, whose creations kindle a responsive thrill in so many breasts. Born in 1447, touching the days of Angelico on the one side, and of Savonarola on the other, Botticelli is at once the product and representative of the times of the Medici. Rich in all culture and knowledge, versed in classic lore, in the appreciation of Greek statuary and drapery, he embodies in his works the art of that splendid age. From Masaccio and Fra Lippi he had learnt the principles of perspective, while an early acquaintance with the goldsmith's shop had given him a love for the rich ornamentation which Verrocchio and Pollaiuolo first introduced into painting. In his choice of subjects he justifies the preference of Lorenzo, whose favourite artist he seems to have been, and shows that he knew how to please the taste of a society that had returned to paganism. The Venus with hanging tresses and roses falling about her, stepping from a shell on to the sea-shore, where quaint-patterned flowers open their blossoms at her feet, and zephyrs blow softly to welcome her; the birth of Spring hailed by Graces and Cupids; a story of Boccaccio or an ancient fable represented by Apelles—these are the themes he delights to celebrate, and mingle with the accustomed altar-pieces of saints and madonnas.

Sometimes his art must stoop lower, and as Court painter he is called upon to take the portrait of La bella Simonetta, the mistress of Julian Medici, or represent on the palace walls the effigies of the conspirators in the plot of the Pazzi. But to all alike he brings the same skill of hand and brain; upon all we find the impress of the same powerful but vehement and fantastic imagination.

Sandro's character, a curious mixture of eccentricity and kindliness, agrees well with his remaining works. As a boy, though highly gifted, he was so turbulent and averse to learning that his father, in despair of his ever studying, apprenticed him to a goldsmith friend of his, Botticello by name, upon which Sandro was seized with a sudden love for painting, for which he developed such taste that he was admitted into the workshop of Filippo Lippi, whose best pupil he speedily became. Through life he was violent in his likes and dislikes, wayward and fitful in temper. He had the greatest admiration for Dante, whose '*Commedia*' he illustrated with engravings of fantastic design; and on one occasion he accused a friend of heresy before the priests because he had dared to speak pub-

licly of the great poet when he himself was ignorant and illiterate. Yet he could be full of kindness, especially to poorer and younger artists, and was, in his gay moods, a most pleasant companion, full of mirth and shrewd sayings. Michael Angelo we know loved him, and frequently wrote to him, and Lionardo honoured him with the name of friend. He delighted in practical jokes, and once horrified a young painter who had just sold a picture by secretly sticking red caps on to the heads of a group of angels in his work, who were thus transformed into the august members of the Signory of Florence, in the centre of which the Madonna presented a singular appearance.

Upon this strange character the preaching of Savonarola had a marvellous effect. Vasari cannot contain himself when he speaks of this degenerate painter becoming a *piagnone*, one of the despised sect of Fra Girolamo. To this cause he goes on to attribute the inaction of Botticelli's later years, 'the disorder of his affairs,' and poverty in which he spent his last days—a poverty so great that he would actually have died of hunger had it not been for the former munificence of Lorenzo and others who held him in honour. Probably Sandro threw himself into the great revival with his usual vehemence; and in the indignant language of Vasari we may read an exaggerated description of that simplicity of life in which so many Florentines carried out the teaching of Savonarola. As regards the inaction of his later days, the absence of dates makes it difficult to confute this statement; but many read the year 1511 in the Greek inscription on that masterpiece of Botticelli's—the 'Nativity, with Singing and Dancing Angels,' now in England,<sup>1</sup> and we know that he frequently devoted his art to the cause to which he had given heart and soul. Vasari mentions as his finest engraving—an art in which he especially excelled—the 'Triumph of the Faith of Savonarola,' and he was the first to paint sacred banners for use in the processions so frequent, as we know, in the friar's time. He also illustrated some of Savonarola's own writings: among them the great sermon preached on the Feast of All Souls, 1496; and it is said that in after years, between 1498 and his own death in 1515, he wrote a life of the martyred prophet and saint of God, of which, however, nothing further is known.

To all these illustrious names one more must be added, that of one greater than all, upon whose genius the word of

<sup>1</sup> In possession of Mr. Fuller Maitland.



Savonarola left an ineffaceable impression. In Lorenzo's days Michael Angelo had grown up in the Medici gardens, and, while still a boy, was already famous. Then it was that he heard the great Dominican, and, having once heard him, never forgot the emotions of that moment. His own brother was one of those who, in the general enthusiasm, took the vows in S. Marco; and thus Michael Angelo was probably brought into closer contact with Savonarola. After Lorenzo's death, however, his son Piero knew little how to appreciate true merit, and was heard to say of Michael Angelo that he held him to be inferior to his Spanish groom, who could outrun a horse. The young artist was of too proud a nature to brook such language; and, disgusted with Piero's folly and vices, he left Florence for Rome, where he remained during the years of Savonarola's greatness and death. Although absent, he took a keen interest in the events that befel his country; and we find him, in 1497, writing to a brother in Florence: 'I derived great comfort from your letter, especially from what I hear of the acts of the saintly Fra Girolamo, who makes all Rome speak of him, where it is said that he is a pestilent heretic; therefore let him by all means come to Rome and preach here, where he will not fail to be worshipped also.'

Years afterwards, when all these hopes had been dashed, and the movement that was to regenerate Christendom had closed in tears and gloom, Michael Angelo still counted himself a *piagnone*; for we find him writing to a friend that he must employ a certain insignificant artist in the works of S. Lorenzo, lest he should be held as doing a wrong to his old friends the *piagnoni*. And when, in 1529, Florence threw off the yoke of the Medici, and declared herself a free republic, when the old cries were heard again, and the Gonfaloniere Niccolò Capponi harangued the Council in the words of Savonarola, proclaiming Christ to be King once more in Florence, then the old enthusiasm again awoke in Michael Angelo's breast, and on the heights of San Miniato he who was great as architect and sculptor, painter and poet, became an engineer to defend his country. That republic, alas! had but a brief existence. Again Pope and Emperor triumphed: the hated Medici returned, and Michael Angelo was bound to the conqueror's chariot-wheels, forced to bend his pride, and purchase a pardon by continuing his works in S. Lorenzo.

In those four 'ineffable types' of Dawn and Twilight, of Day and Night, which by a strange irony he placed on the tombs of the Medici, all the bitterness of his despair, the

fierce agony of the struggle which tore that mighty heart, found expression. There we see what it cost him to see a tyrant reigning in that Florence which Savonarola had called the City of God, how profoundly his spirit grieved over the Night of oppression and shame which had sunk on Florence, and the Dawn which could never break for her again. He himself has given us the key to their meaning in those lines which he wrote under his Night, in the eyes of all Florence :

'Grato m'è il sonno, e'l più esser di sasso  
Mentre che il danno e la vergogna dura ;  
Non veder, non sentir, m'è gran ventura,  
Però non mi destar, deh ! parla basso !'

Henceforth art was the only consolation left him, the only form in which he could attain to that ideal after which he had yearned. It is still the ardent disciple of Savonarola, with convictions only deepened by the lapse of time, that we find in the unparalleled grandeur of the frescoes of the Sistine, where the pomps and vanities of the world, the vices of the clergy are sternly denounced, and merciless demons drag the luxurious and selfish to endless death. And as the evening shadows deepened, and the long life drew slowly to its end, the thought of Savonarola was ever present with him. Vasari relates how this great man, 'who was also an excellent Christian, delighted in the study of the Scriptures, and the sermons of Savonarola, whom he had heard in his youth ;' and Condivi speaks of the affection he bore to the memory of the friar, whose voice still seemed to ring in his ears.

The teaching of Savonarola thus still bore fruit more than sixty years after his death, and in that last sonnet to Vasari, the hand which poised the Dome of S. Peter's could write—

Nè pinger, nè scolpir fia più che queti,  
L'animo volta a quell' amor divino,  
Ch'aperse a prender noi in croce le braccia :—

lines which contain the experience of a life of more than eighty years, gathered up, as it were, in the last sonnet he sent to Vasari. The bark had well-nigh reached the haven, the waves were almost passed, and Savonarola had been right after all. Neither painting nor sculpture without Christ could content the soul that yearned after God. As he lay dying, the last words he spoke to those who wept around him were : 'My friends, when you are dying, remember the sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

Such was the work of Savonarola, such were the men who

bore his words to the end of their lives, and carried down the '*faith of the friar*' to succeeding generations.

Because he failed, because that dream of a Christian republic proved too ideal for earth, let us not say that his work was vain. That God whom he had owned as a God whose way is in the deep waters, and whose footsteps are not known, watched over His servant's work, and out of his seeming failure, his suffering and death came forth the great results. It is not ours to tell how that revival of true religion in the Church for which Savonarola prayed came at last, how later ages have learnt to hold his name sacred for all time; it is only of a small part of his work that we have to speak.

By holding up a high ideal to that corrupt age, he opened new horizons to all its artists, and gave a new impulse to art in all its forms. Whether, then, we tread the cloister of S. Marco, where his memory meets us at every turn, or gaze upon the masterpieces of the Pitti and the Uffizzi, or the wonders of Michael Angelo's S. Peter's—let us remember the part Savonarola had in forming the men to whom we owe these glories of art, and feel that in them the fire of his enthusiasm, the ardour of his burning words, is living yet. He being dead, yet speaketh.

One word more. We have seen that with his unflinching severity, with all his stern condemnation of evil, Savonarola was no puritan fanatic, that in his teaching there was nothing antagonistic to art. Catholic in this, as in all else, it was his wish and endeavour that all culture, all art and knowledge, should be directed to their highest uses, and that Mother Church, 'Like the mild Virgin with the outstretched robe,' should fold to her bosom all that was fair and pure and good:—an endeavour which must be ours too, if in these days of ever-widening culture, the Church of this land is to hold her own against the forces which oppose her.

At the present time there is one respect in which the Church can especially further the cause of that art to which, if we believe some of its votaries, we are to look for the regeneration of our race. The problem which is constantly before all earnest advocates of culture, all at least who look beyond a merely selfish gratification of personal tastes, is how best to promote the best influences of art among all classes. This object the Church, more than any other influence, has it in her power to advance. Freely, largely, she gives. Not for the eyes of the high and wealthy alone are the splendours of her raiment spread—that vesture of gold wrought about with divers colours, wherewith she robes herself to go

forth and meet her King. Her courts are open, her beauties are displayed to the poorest and meanest, with the same boundless royalty of gift.

To many an agricultural labourer whose horizon is bounded by the fields of his native village, to many a weary toiler who drags out a painful existence amid the smoke and blackness of our manufacturing towns, deprived of all that makes life bright, the only ray of beauty, the only pure idea of art they can ever have, must come from the church within whose walls they worship. That East window, whose storied panes tell the old familiar tale of the Crucified Lord, that altar-piece where they see Him risen or transfigured, that pealing organ, whose sweet melodies are often the only true music that ever reaches their ears, may be to them revelations of a higher world, gleams of a brighter day, associated with that one message which lifts their hearts above the hard realities of outward existence. Surely this, although a secondary, is a worthy aim to keep in view; surely it is no mistaken ambition which would lead us to fill those churches, which are the shrines of Truth, with those accessories of Art and Beauty which Truth alone can truly inspire, and through which Truth knows how to speak to all her children.

So, while we bring our best to God, offer upon His altars, as is our bounden duty, all that is rare and lovely, we shall have the joy of feeling that no home is so poor, no life so degraded, but that the light of beauty can penetrate its darkness and ignorance with blessed influence; so, too, insensibly, the thought of art blending with that worship which is man's highest privilege, may raise us to that moral serenity, that clearness of vision in things unseen, which is the end and object of true culture.

#### ART. VI—PREACHING AT THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

*Preaching at the Council of Trent.* Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandam spectantium amplissima Collectio. Tomus I. Complectens Conciones. Prodit nunc primum studio ed opera JUDOCI LE PLAT. (Lovanii, MDCCLXXXI.)

It is not a little mortifying to the students of Church history to learn, on the high authority of Professor Ranke, that an

authentic history of the Council of Trent will never be undertaken. Its importance is almost immeasurable, and in proportion to the influence of its results over the hearts and convictions of millions have been the fierceness of the controversies which have surrounded it. Without inviting our readers to any discussion of the rival claims of Pallavicini and Paolo Sarpi, we propose to lay before them in a short compass some illustrations of the doctrine and condition of the Church of Rome at the period of the Council, derived from sources beyond all suspicion of unfavourable partisanship. About a century ago, Le Plat, Professor of Roman Law at the University of Louvain, published in seven large quarto volumes a collection of documents which might serve to illustrate the history of the Council; and to the first of these, which consists of sermons preached before the assembled Fathers, we are indebted for the substance of our article. To estimate rightly the value of the testimony these sermons afford, it must be remembered that the preachers were selected by the presiding legates, so that the more liberal party in the Council had but slight opportunity of being adequately represented in the pulpit; whilst a conscientious perusal of every line of these 700, often very dreary, pages enables us to affirm that in no single instance did a preacher venture to call in question the dark picture of the Church's condition as painted in many of these discourses.

The first Session of the Council was held on the third Sunday in Advent, December 13, 1545; and after high mass the Bishop of Bitonto ascended the pulpit. He began with a shriek of triumph, 'Rejoice in the Lord, my Fathers; rejoice in the Lord, my brethren; and again I say, rejoice all! Behold now is the accepted time! Behold now is the day of most certain and long-expected salvation!' All nature, animate and inanimate, seemed to the enthusiastic prelate to be exulting at the opening of the Council. For the oppression of the poor and for the sighing of the needy Church the Lord had at length awoken, and safety was at hand. He frequently mingles quaint applications of sacred words in strange bathos with the feeblest puns, as he foretells that the Church, which has been languishing for a century through lack of such a stay, will derive greater benefit from this synod than from that of flowery Florence or that of most constant Constance. Councils had appointed deacons, expounded creeds, refuted heretics, bound heretics (he might have added, and their authors) in bundles for the flames, reformed manners, quelled the Mussulman, reduced the civil power to

due submission to ecclesiastical authority, anathematised monarchs, and even shed a greater lustre on the Papal tiara. Nay, such was their glory, that the creation of man and the confusion of tongues are described on the threshold of revelation as determined on in a Council of the undivided Trinity. After this prelude the Bishop portrayed the condition of priest and people in the darkest colours. The fine gold had become dim. The young children ask bread, and there is none to give it them. Within the pale of Christendom is corruption; without is terror through the Turks, and *the fault is all their own*. Let them not take offence at his plain speaking. Anon he returns to the hopes which the Council inspires. It has been summoned by a Pope whose fulsome adulation reaches its climax when Paul III. is termed a quasi-deity. It is presided over by Del Monte, whose eyes and heart are ever directed to the mountain which is Christ; by Politianus, who has long laboured to amend the policy of Christendom, and by Pole, who is rather an angel than an Anglican. The light of the Pope is come into the world, but men love darkness rather than light.

At the second Session, January 7, 1546, Martyranus, Bishop of S. Mark, delivered a tremendous philippic against the manners of the times. It reads like a page from one of the orations against Verres or the indictment against heathenism in the Epistle to the Romans. Cruelty was their delight, rapine their sport, bloodshed their amusement. Nor did he confine himself to generalities, but roundly asserted that the evil lives of the clergy underlay all the mischief. 'O pastors!' he cried; 'O cities set upon a hill, who ought to shine more brightly than the sun, we, by our example, have slain the sheep of the Lord!' Such plain speaking could not have been distasteful to the Presidents, as Martyranus was appointed to preach again on March 13, 1547, but he was then too hoarse to speak. Pallavicini says he also occupied the pulpit at a later date, but we have no copy of his sermon.

A special interest attaches to any sermons by the Dominican, Ambrose Catharin, not only on account of the important part which he filled as a theologian in the deliberations of the Council, but also because he was one of the most popular orators of the day; and we learn from Massarelli's private diary, he was requested by the President to preach every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. In a sermon on February 4, 1546, after speaking of the hopes and fears which the Council causes him, he reminds them of the Saviour's



warning, 'Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to have thee, that he might sift thee as wheat,' &c.

'I doubt not, O most holy Synod, all this applies to thee; for thou, according to the spiritual understanding of the text, art Peter, since he who bears the keys of Peter is included in you as your head. Beware of the sifter! Remember that he assailed the Apostolic Council, and by his sifting gained one of the twelve.' With a sudden change of the metaphor, he continued:—'The sieve is the most Sacred Body of our Lord, which was torn with scourges and pierced with nails and lance. That body signifies the Church, which has one Head, the Lord Jesus, whose vicar on earth is Paul III. He who is not under the Head is not in the Body; he who despises the vicar, despises also the Lord; he who is separated from Him, falls through the sieve, and now belongs not to Christ, but to Satan. Let each one, then, so arrange himself in the sieve, that he may not, through any effort of Satan, be cast out.'

Such strong affirmation, put so clearly and quaintly, might well be to the mind of the majority of the Council; nor was the taste of the age likely to disapprove the rest of the sermon, which thus allegorised the story of S. Peter's denial. The Church is now assailed by two maids and a man-servant. The first handmaid is the flesh, prone to the good things of this world; the second is ambition and pride, the nurse and mother of all heretics; and his hearers must take heed lest this maiden should mislead any of them to deny or withstand the Council. The man of fierce aspect may easily be recognised to mean the secular power.

The General of the Servites preached on April 8, 1546, a sermon, of which the first two-thirds might have been delivered in any orthodox Protestant pulpit, and which breathed the spirit of Augustinian theology; and it is not until he touches on the trials of the Church, and the contempt manifested of its authority, that his conservative spirit breaks out. Yet even then he gives wise and temperate advice, which, had it been followed, would have spared much discredit to the Council, and possibly much disunion to Christendom.

'Great as is doubtless the authority of the Council, let his hearers beware of those who would advise them to go too far; let them observe the true principle *ne quid nimis*; let them be on their guard lest they should vest with undue authority familiar forms of teaching, so that if they hear anything diverse in instruction but in no respect contrary to faith and good morals, they should madly exclaim, Heresy! Lutheran or Zwinglian dogma, drive it out; to the flames with it! Let them preserve the fitting dignity of a Council, and be content to define the fundamentals only of religion, faith, and morals,

and leave minor questions to each one's liberty and free choice. That was the very worst kind of reform which desired amendment in others, neglected in itself. The bishops and clergy inveighed against others and omitted their own duties; the princes ruled oppressively and arbitrarily, and would not suffer their powers to be even touched; the people raged against the faults of their superiors and forgot their own; all were sharp-sighted as lynxes to others' failings, blind as worms to their own faults. Let the Fathers at so serious a crisis begin the reformation in their own persons, lest it should justly be said to them, "Physician, heal thyself."

The reformation of clerical abuses was indeed sorely needed, but it was not so easy to determine how to effect it, or where to begin. Pluralities were so flagrant, and their inevitable consequences, the absence of even the bishops from their dioceses, was so universal, that the Cardinal-President Del Monte asserted that the progress of the Reformation was due to this one cause. Had the bishops been at their posts, heresy would not have found its way among their flocks. Yet how was a remedy to be applied and what form was the decree to take by which it should be enjoined upon the Church? Nowhere were the scandals of patronage and nepotism so notorious as at the Court of Rome. Only ten years before this (in 1534) the reigning Pontiff, Clement VII., had given to his cousin, Cardinal Hypolite de' Medici, all the benefices which should fall vacant during six months throughout the whole Christian world. Moreover, the Papacy had already so completely swallowed up the episcopate, that a long and angry discussion arose whether residence was a duty enjoined by Divine or only by Papal authority. In either case the residence of the bishops could effect little so long as their authority was constantly overridden by Papal dispensations allowing monks to preach strange doctrines without leaving the bishops any power to silence them. Nor could many of the prelates live upon the scanty income of bishoprics which were often so reduced by pensions as to be almost worthless. Amidst the distractions and difficulties of such a position of affairs, we can imagine the Fathers listening with some impatience to a long and windy discourse on Ascension Day, which was concluded in terms which, if neither practicable nor palatable, are at least pithy enough in the original, which informs the Council it would effect a real triumph if it observed three things: 'Primum, si in vestros, ne dicam vos ipsos, non fueritis indulgentiores, sed cum æquitate severi. Secundum, si ea quæ decreveritis, servaveritis primi. Tertium, si maturaveritis.'

Yet all the sermons preached before the Council during the pontificate of Paul III., and, indeed, during the whole long term of its existence, must yield in outspoken boldness of utterance to that delivered on February 27, 1547, by George de St. James. His subject was the 'Temptation,' and he very ingeniously turned it against the prevailing abuses of non-residence and dispensations.

'Those who serve the altar are specially set upon the pinnacle of the temple. Them the Lord of discipline and safety warns, lest, misled by the devil, induced by texts wrongly cited or misunderstood, or by dispensations which profess to supply reasons and a sufficiency which they do not possess, they should cast themselves down and be sorely crushed. Following the opinion of those who, from not distinguishing human from divine right, human from divine precepts, regard dispensers as sovereign, they esteem it certain that personal obligations can be performed by deputy, as if one could enter into and enjoy heaven by proxy; and making no distinction between a Christian and a cruel dispensation, they imagine whatever is allowed by the law of the Forum is permitted also by the law of heaven.'

Presently he treats of the remedies which all men are eagerly expecting, remedies which are all the more necessary, since the devil has broken into the fold, and has taken good care that bishoprics, dignities, and fat benefices should be conferred, not on men of worth, learning, and probity, nor even on men of mature age, experience, and zeal, but on the unworthy and unlearned, nay, even on sciolists and boys. Priest and Levite alike had come down and looked upon the people of God, which lay despoiled, wounded, and half dead, and had passed by; and the people, sorely smitten, and seeing the avarice of the priest and the negligence of the Levite, had fallen into frenzy and fury, and had begun, like men possessed, to trample all the mysteries of religion, to blaspheme, contradict, and profane Christ's divine sacraments, the apostolic traditions, the ceremonies of the Church, the decrees of sacred councils, the authority of pontiffs and bishops, the precepts of the Fathers, works of penitence, the monastic life, and, in fine, all good works, save a certain rash and feigned faith, the dream of one wretched Martin Luther, who, like another Jeroboam, had made God's Israel to sin. But the Saviour, the true Samaritan, who can save equally by many or by few, will bring healing and salvation through the Council, if it will only observe His precepts. But for this they must be 'the salt of the earth' before they can be 'the light of the world.' Reformation of character must come before definition of dogma. He enlarges on this point at

length, and with all plainness of speech. It is beyond all dispute that the errors of this unhappy time have arisen through abuses, have increased through abuses, and are spread through almost all the Church through abuses; and unless the abuses are removed, what you may by your decrees condemn as heresies will hardly be put an end to, and most likely far more numerous and worse errors will arise.

We are obliged to pass some of the fanciful theories of Church hierarchy in which several preachers indulged, notably the derivation by more than one divine of the cardinalate as being conferred by our Blessed Lord on the two sons of Zebedee. We shall have occasion presently to remark how 'the privilege of Peter' was treated at this period by its staunchest supporters; and shall see that then, as now, it was invariably set forth with the calm assumption of the position which needed to be proved. Yet in the earlier years of the Council, as represented by these sermons, we trace a strong element of moderate doctrine, and a larger proportion (if the anachronism may be pardoned) of Jansenist to Jesuit theology. Despite the occasional fierceness of the preachers towards the Protestants, and which, we must remember, finds some palliation in the excesses of the Anabaptists, with whom, in the minds of many Catholics, all the seceders from Rome were probably identified, a high tone pervades most of the sermons preached before the removal of the Council to Bologna. The last discourse before that event which Le Plat has preserved was by Antonio Marinario, a Carmelite friar, on March 20, 1547, and asserts in careful and well-balanced statement the necessity of faith which should bring home to the heart the assurance of God's mercy, and of good works, to prove that faith is real and living.

It is not within our present purpose to enter upon the circumstances under which the Council was transferred to Bologna. The Pope and the Emperor were now at open variance, and the German prelates did not dare to leave Trent. Yet Rome, as usual, put on a bold front, and at the first Session at Bologna (April 21, 1547), although only thirty-four bishops were present, they assumed the full powers of the Council, and declared their removal 'instant, urgent, and legitimate.' On the same day Ambrose Catharin thus struck the keynote from the pulpit, after a rapid summary of the work of the Council, which he admitted had at first progressed very slowly; he declared there was no longer any reason why the Fathers should tarry at Trent for the sake of the Germans, since all—

*'which had reference to them had been fully discussed and concluded. If they allow this, the Council has already attained the result which it desired ; but, if not,' he added loftily—'if any are so disposed as to contravene it, moved by either a contentious or a censorious spirit, let all such know that the Holy Synod cannot consistently with its own dignity admit anything so insolent, unheard of, and altogether preposterous ; nay, it is altogether beyond its power, for it would not be lawful for it to change a single syllable of any sentence which has been determined, since, if there be any such a thing as faith in the world, it must indubitably be believed that not men, but that God's Holy Spirit promulgated its decrees.'*

Such exaggerated pretensions, which admit of no qualification without peril to her whole position, have ever been the forte and the foible of Rome. They were doubtless agreeable to the audience to whom they were addressed, and seemed well suited to the occasion, especially as they were coupled with earnest exhortations to personal piety, and to a life worthy of the high ecclesiastical status of his hearers. The whole work of reformation, he added, 'centres in the choice of good pastors.' Mature age, sound doctrine, uprightness of conduct, the savour of godliness, and public testimony and evidence of all these, complete a holy choice. Let each one of you, then, try and prove himself before God, and see whether he can recognise so much in himself that he can say with Peter with a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, 'Lord, thou knowest all things ; thou knowest that I love thee more than my possessions, more than my family, more than my life and soul.'

There is a blank of four years after this sermon in Le Plat, and we find at first a marked deterioration in the quality of the discourses pronounced in the earlier sessions of the Council under Julius III. At a full assembly of bishops gathered at the house of Cardinal Crescentius, one of the new Presidents, a brief address by Paul Passota was chiefly occupied with discussion of the spiritual meaning of the number two. This is traced through the two sexes, the necessary twofold character of every relation, the two great lights in the heavens, two tables of the law, two elements of mind and body, man's two eyes, ears, arms, and thighs (!), the two testaments, Peter's two swords, two disciples on their way to Emmaus, our Lord crucified between two thieves, two keys committed to Peter, two men in white at the sepulchre, two natures—human and divine. It were hard to conceive a more incongruous medley. The next preacher, the Archbishop of Sassari, was hardly superior, either in style or

perspicacity. His sermon was in praise of the Eucharist, and his mind was evidently confused with the twofold meaning of our Lord's mystic body, as the food of His people and as the Church. Of that body, he asserts the Pope is the visible head, and the Blessed Virgin the neck! (a visible head, forsooth, joined to the body by an invisible neck.) The right eye was the twelve apostles, the left the seventy disciples. But soon the two eyes are the upper and lower orders of prelates; the tongue, the preachers; the ears, the people; and the heart, the priesthood. Nor was the thought more felicitous which prompted him to invite Germany to return to the communion of the Church of Rome, as to a banquet ready prepared, 'where we will satisfy your hunger with the food of the sacred body, and quench your thirst with the chalice of the Saviour's blood,' at the very moment when the Council was deciding not to allow the cup to the laity.

On New Year's day, 1552, Everhard Billicus, a Carmelite and theologian, from Cologne, preached at great length on the Circumcision. His sermon combines in curious juxtaposition striking and appropriate remarks upon the reasons why our Lord was born into so humble a condition, with strange and fantastic accommodation of texts of Scripture to the ruined condition of mankind. With a minuteness of detail about delicate points which is as foreign to modern as it was congenial to monastic taste, he unfolds the true meaning of circumcision, and proves from Leviticus and Deuteronomy that under the law it had a spiritual signification. The tone and style of the preacher greatly improve as he unfolds the deep prophetic import of Genesis xvii. 13—'My covenant shall be in your flesh, for an everlasting covenant,' which meets its fulfilment in Christ, the true flesh of Abraham; so that we, who are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones, were all circumcised in Him. It were long to tell with what legitimate ingenuity he drew a practical lesson from every item of the first establishment of this covenant; how it began with Abraham, who corresponded in rank with the hierarchy, then descended to his sons on a line with the clergy, then to his family, the Christian laity; how Abraham circumcised himself, to signify that the hierarchy must reform itself, no meaner hand must prune away its faults; how he did it on that same day, to show that recognition of the need for reformation must be followed by immediate performance. How the nature of the amputation, *circum*, implied no sparing or superficial treatment; but one which embraced the entire circle of evil;



how the instrument could only be found in God's word, as described in Hebrews iv. 12 ; and how the application of this trenchant remedy was the very purpose of the Synod's assembling. At great length he combats the notion that it will be enough for the Council to determine sound doctrine, without entering upon reformation of manners, and he traced to this cause the extinction of the Gospel in Africa and Asia.

One other of the sermons delivered during the second period of the Council's protracted existence is too characteristic to be passed over. It illustrates the Roman habit of exaggerating the importance of, and maintaining on untenable grounds, observances which are of great value in their proper place and when supported by valid reasons ; whilst the strange misapplication of Scripture with which it closes is in full accord with many modern arguments in behalf of the Pope's authority. The day was Ash Wednesday, the preacher Adeodatus of Siena. After enlarging in his exordium upon the misery of man, whom 600 and more kinds of diseases assail, and no fewer mischances assault, and on whom, in consequence of his sin, penitence is incumbent, he proceeds to say that our Lord, in his rebuke to Chorazin and Bethsaida by adding, ' If the mighty works which have been done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes,' seems clearly enough (*diserte satis*) to have approved this ceremony of ashes ! ' But I pray the dust before the wind, and the trodden-down clay of the streets—I mean the heretical innovators, who deride, bark at, and rise up against this pious sprinkling of the ashes, to hearken. For, if the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the ashes of the sacred palm branches, consecrated by the evangelical priesthood, through the word of God and prayer, and reverently received by the faithful, as the Church piously believes, and also so solemnly prays, sanctify, or at least avail for sanctification,' with more of like import. He urges the Council to complete its work in accordance with the earnest desire of the Pope Julius III., who is described as, ' *episcoporum princeps, apostolorum heres, potestate Petrus, unctione vero Christus.*' What manner of man he really was many of the audience knew well enough, for, as Cardinal del Monte, he had presided over the Council until the death of Paul III., and as pontiff he was chiefly distinguished for his love of ease, and his indulgence in remarks 'which sometimes mingled blushes with the smiles of his guest.' 'Let the heretics,' continued the preacher, 'acknowledge their true pastor,

the Pope, to whom the keys have been given, and to whom the sheep have been entrusted. You indeed, also, O Fathers, are by divine right, door-keepers of heaven, and pastors of the flock; but he, in a degree much higher and more perfect, much more excellent and glorious, as *he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name* than his partners and consorts. He it is to whom whatsoever is not united, and on whom whatsoever does not depend, is undone (so teaches the Gospel), and does not belong to the unity of the building of the Church, beyond whose pale whosoever is found will perish in the deluge that shall come upon the world. Let all then be imbued with his doctrine, obey his commands, acquiesce in his precepts, for whose faith Jesus Christ, the Good Shepherd, the Prince of Pastors, and the Bishop of our souls, prayed in a special manner, and *was heard on account of his fear*.<sup>1</sup>

It was hardly to be expected that the Protestants would follow this counsel, as the Fathers themselves were very restive, and gave the Pope so much trouble that he gladly took advantage of the first pretext which offered itself to suspend the Council, and nine years elapsed before it reassembled. In the interval, no less than three Popes had passed away, and the state of Europe had been materially altered. The questions now brought before the Council had exclusive reference to the internal policy of the Church of Rome, as all hope of recovering the Protestants through its agency was abandoned. To determine the relations of the Pope with the Catholic sovereigns of Europe, and to establish such a system of discipline as should effectually maintain his supremacy over the whole Roman priesthood throughout the world, were the points to which its deliberations henceforth were confined. Nor did Pius IV. veil his pretensions to limit the Council to such subjects as it was agreeable to him should be discussed. No sooner were the prelates again gathered at Trent, than the presiding legate declared that by the terms of their commission they had the exclusive right to determine what matters should be submitted for deliberation. It was in vain that a minority of the bishops protested. A considerable number of the Fathers were entirely under the control of Pius IV., who complained openly of the expense he had to bear in maintaining them during their residence at Trent. But the prospect at first was so unfavourable to the hopes and aims of the Papacy, that the Pope and Cardinals were disturbed by the gloomiest appre-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. v. 7.

hensions. The sermons of this period abound in allusions to contentions within the bosom of the Council. The Spanish, German, and French bishops were on one side, the Italians on the other; and fears were entertained of an open rupture. So early as March 1, 1562, the preacher, a Venetian Augustine friar, thus addressed the President:—

‘It is your duty in this holy Council, most illustrious and most reverend legates of the Apostolic See, most especially in virtue of your office, to restrain all the Fathers of this sacred Synod in the bond of peace, and to allow nothing to be said or done which can diminish the Council’s dignity or reputation, or to induce the hearts of those who are outside our pale to cleave more tenaciously to their errors.’

The dangers thus alluded to were clearly not averted for a long season, and more than one preacher reverts to them in terms of entreaty and almost of despair.

With no sparing hand did the preachers, and very specially the Spaniards, continue to lash the faults of the clergy. On the sixth Sunday in Lent, Juan Fonseca, theologian to the Archbishop of Granada, touched upon the sacredness of the priestly office, and the scandal caused by clerical disregard of its responsibilities. He quoted Psalm xli. 9 and Psalm lv. 12–14, in proof of his position, and added:—‘For this reason, all the ministers of the Church, who formerly were venerated by all as fathers and gods, are now esteemed by many as the offscouring of the age, and are held in derision, “*exigentibus nostris demeritis, exigentibus nostris peccatis.*”’ His immediate successor, a Spaniard again, Peyra d’Andrada, declared on Easter Sunday: ‘The enemies of the Christian name fight us with our own weapons, and derive their arguments from our vices, by the aid of which they draw a cloud over the purity of the Catholic Church, and endeavour to destroy its integrity.’ The Protestants (he declared) draw most of the reasons they allege against us from a comparison of the lives of our priests with that of the Christians of the first ages, and they come very naturally to the conclusion that orthodoxy in doctrine is hardly likely to have been maintained where there is such glaring imperfection in morals. Subsequent preachers return again and again to the same theme. It was customary for a bishop to preach on the day on which a formal session was held, at which the decrees elaborated and prepared in the Congregations were solemnly promulgated, and at the twentieth session, held June 4, 1562, Ragazzo, Bishop of Nazianzum, was appointed to this office. His brief address is full of anxiety lest the Council should

break up without accomplishing its task. Above all else, the reformation of the clergy was urgent and indispensable. They should aim at conforming their character to the standard enjoined by the Apostle to Timothy and Titus, so that they might be an example to all the faithful in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in chastity. This was what all the Christian world expected from them, and the ambassadors of the sovereign powers were there to enforce its necessity. Yet, he added, despondingly enough, 'hitherto we have done next to nothing.'

Plain-spoken as were these utterances, there were others who dared to enter into more minute details. On the third Sunday after Trinity, Peter Morcatus employed language of unparalleled boldness :—

'I frequently hear many of you complaining that kings and princes seize unlawfully the property of the Church. I affirm that the fault is with yourselves. So long as you care more for the benefice than you do for its duties, so long as you are given to avarice, and do not minister God's word and sacraments without reward, according to our Lord's command, "freely ye have received, freely give," so long will those in power despise both you and your canons.'

Having further enlarged upon the avarice of the clergy, he next proceeds to attack the matter of their sermons. It is not without great injury to the whole Church that, instead of God's word, the interpreters of His law inculcate upon the people their own fancies and falsehoods, intermingling with them at times fictitious miracles: men like these they ought to expel, not merely from a single State, but from the entire universe. Such men were the dead flies in the ointment, which corrupted the sweetness of the word of God. Let the Fathers take heed, and that speedily, that no more scandals should arise from the existence of this abuse.

From this subject he turns back again to the personal character of the priesthood :—

'The Bishop of Coimbra had said that all abuses could be got rid of if only the two words, *non obstantibus*, with which Papal dispensations commenced, could be banished from the Church of God. But we must have in the Church of God a Pontiff who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities: we must have a pastor who will feed us, and allure us, by the offer and the grant of indulgences, to prayer and fasting, to almsgiving and sacramental confession, by which we may be reconciled to God and man. But, in truth, the holy bishop did not wish these things to be done away with, but he spoke in condemnation of the lavish use of dispensations, whilst the Pope was meanwhile ill-advised or misinformed. I think it

would be more advantageous to the Church if two words, not of human but of divine authority, were most carefully treasured up and observed, Freely give.'

He proceeds to say, that the greater number of the bishops (*plerique episcoporum*) made large incomes out of the highest censures of the Church, which were iniquitously employed on the most trifling grounds. The Apostle smote the incestuous person at Corinth, and some who were blasphemers and disobedient to God's word, with an anathema, but now the Church is filled with fornicators, blasphemers, and impugnors of God's word, who are left in undisturbed repose, and an anathema is only employed against those who are too poor to pay even a small fee for its remission. Church censures, too, are inflicted for the most trifling causes, such as dog-stealing or other petty larceny. With grim humour, he adds, 'hitherto such things were allowable, but now, when we see what scandal to the Church the bishops cause by such abuse of them, it is imperative that you should consider with what wedge you can cleave this rugged knot.'

He goes on to assert that without consulting the bishop, or even his vicar, excommunication is frequently inflicted by their clerks (*à scribis*)—a race proverbially avaricious; who, in disregard of our Lord's command that, by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established, and of S. Paul's injunction first to assemble the church together, inflict excommunication, which is more serious than any other penalty, without any of the precautions which are adopted before a sentence of death, of scourging, or of exile.

Another point needing attention is the rapacity of the friends and relatives of dying prelates, who are so eager to build up a great estate at the expense of the Church, that they begin to pillage before the Apostolic Chamber can come and take what belongs to it; and even dukes, counts, and nobles, who would under no other circumstances be guilty of felony, plunder and carry off a bishop's treasures.

The Most Holy Father, Pius IV., had already set the example by reforming the Penitentiary, at least partially, and so had our Lord himself, by his cleansing of the Temple. Besides all this, there were priests without learning or usefulness, murderers and adulterers, who must be rooted up like the thorns and thistles of Hosea (x. 8) from the altars of the Lord. Nor must they any longer plead for delay, lest the day of vengeance should come upon them.

Towards the close of his sermon, Morcatus touched upon the much debated question of the residence of the bishops

in their dioceses, and founded his arguments in its favour upon one of the strangest misapprehensions of a text we ever met with. Misled, apparently, by the ambiguity of the Vulgate in Exodus xxv. 22 (*Loquar ad te supra propitiatorium*), he took it to mean, 'I will speak to you as *you* sit upon the mercy-seat,' instead of 'I will speak to you from my seat above the mercy-seat,' and he argued from it as follows :—

'God therefore prescribes a place to Moses, as though He would not speak with him unless he sat between the two cherubim. This mercy-seat, on which Moses sits, represents the Church, outside which is neither salvation nor remission, nor propitiation for sins. The two cherubim are the two Testaments, &c. Therefore let the pastor reside in his church, for that is the place assigned to him by the command of the Lord: otherwise the Lord will not hold communion with him.'

It is no wonder that the discussion of the vexed question of residence excited the keenest anxiety at the Papal court. Not only was the authority of the Pope assailed in a vital point if the episcopate were to be regarded as held by direct tenure from our Lord Himself, instead of being first wholly centred in the Bishop of Rome, and thence delivered by him to those who should hold it as his delegates, but now a further assault was openly made upon his power and influence. If residence were of divine and universal obligation, the existence of a bishop without a diocese was arbitrary, anomalous, unwarrantable. Such a conclusion would at once annihilate the whole body of titular prelates and bishops *in partibus* who both at Trent and in our own day have been amongst the most valuable auxiliaries of the Papacy. In truth it was hard to say where the desire of reformation or innovation would stop. Bohemia and Hungary were demanding that the cup should be restored to the laity, and that the marriage of priests should be conceded, and their demand was supported by the urgent importunity of the Emperor's ambassadors. The presiding legates had to exert all their powers of conciliation to evade these embarrassing claims, and it had been arranged that the concession of the chalice should for the present be passed over in silence, when on the day on which the twenty-first session of the Council was held, Sbardellato, Bishop of Tininia, and orator of the lord prelates and clergy of Hungary, made it the entire subject of his sermon.

After such strong animadversions upon the chief Protestant theologians, of whom he mentioned Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Ecolampadius, Osiander, Bucer, and Swenckfeld by name, as might give full assurance of his own orthodoxy, he



stated that so long as the fervour of early Christian love was maintained the cup had been accorded to all the faithful alike. He next explained the circumstances under which the laity had gradually been deprived of it, and then went on to urge, and even to promise its early restoration to those who desired it, in terms whose boldness was but thinly veiled under the guise of earnest importunity :—

‘Oh, most illustrious Fathers, look upon your wandering children ; with eagerness and alacrity welcome them on their return, and embrace, cherish, and retain by every possible means those who are leaving you. Be not so much judges as fathers to them. Recall those who have fallen away from you with gentle words, stretch forth your hands, draw to you those who are returning. Expel all bitterness from your minds, lay aside all feeling of offence, cast away all anger. Set before you the Christ of pity, not the God of vengeance. Restore to the Christian world the inheritance which our Saviour so shortly before His death left us as a most ample and blessed legacy, marked out in the tables of his sacred testament. You see with what dissension, with what discord, with what hatred, the subject is debated. Where is your pity, where your charity, where your compassion for your children? Come and help to extinguish so vast and widespread a conflagration, lest the whole world, mainly through your fault, should appear to have been set on fire by this miserable flame. You will not be able fairly to face the matter until in pity for the folly of your children you have yielded to their infirmity, and quenched this incredible thirst of theirs by which they are tormented day and night. This cannot be until you have in no grudging spirit granted them that blood of Christ which they yearn for so eagerly with gaping mouths and thirsty lips.’

The determination of the majority to refuse all concession, did not restrain the preacher from uttering a weighty rebuke of their unconciliatory spirit. ‘Christ would not have you so tenacious of your decision, that on account of this blood which He shed for all, there should be such sad and pernicious dissension ; nay, rather for this very cause He willed to shed His blood, and to undergo the most shameful death, namely, that we being mindful of His love towards us, might be united in heart and might live in the closest concord. Do not suppose that those who with such earnestness, with such eagerness, with such ardour, long and pray for the blood of Christ, will not regard it with the utmost reverence, will not remove from it every profanation.’ Some pointed remarks upon the urgent need of residence, concluded a sermon which excited no small wrath in the legates, and in many more of the audience.

The address of the next speaker, recorded by Le Plat, is pitched in a very different key. After some appropriate

observations on the Beatitudes and their striking contrast to ordinary notions of happiness, the priestly character, as the salt of the earth and the light of the world, was very ably worked out. The idea of sacerdotal responsibility being thus introduced gives occasion for a striking example of the cool assurance with which, under similar circumstances, Romish writers intermingle Holy Scripture and legend. 'S. Paul,' he observes, 'was oppressed with "the care of all the Churches;" on the shoulders of S. Peter there rested the immense weight of the whole Christian world, yet he was inflamed with such love to Christ, that so vast a burden seemed light to him.' He related the story of a philosopher who recommended his son not to preach, because if he spoke the truth he would have the people for his enemy; if falsehood, God. He reminded his hearers that they must be constant and firm in restraining the spirit of liberty in these dangerous days when evil men made evangelical truth serve as an occasion for sensuality: an oft-repeated accusation against the Protestants because they allowed the marriage of priests and monastic persons.

One form of licence many of the preachers indulged in freely enough. No ingenuity was too subtle, and no fiction too baseless, if only it would serve to prop up the theory of the infallibility and the universal supremacy of S. Peter. Three examples will serve to illustrate the manner in which this fundamental dogma of Rome was handled by some of its ablest advocates.

The first occurs in a sermon preached on S. John's Day, 1561, by Cæsar Ferrantius. His discourse commences with a *deprecatio benevolentiae*, the usual form of exordium, but surpasses almost all in the extravagance of its adulation:—

'Many things deter me from speaking in this place and before men of such worth and rank. For if Daniel and Manuel, the father of Samson, could not bear the sight of angels, but were afraid, and trembled, and fell on their faces to the earth, it were much more fitting that I should fear to approach this place and your presence. For you are here in session as representing the whole world, and as filling the place of God, and you will judge not only the twelve tribes of Israel, but even almost (*etiam pene*, a strange qualification!) angels themselves.'

Then after deducing 'the privilege of Peter' from the thrice-repeated commission, 'Feed my sheep,' he offers the following comment upon S. Peter's inquiry about S. John and our Blessed Lord's reply to it:—

'He, who before his denial of Christ dared not ask which of the Apostles would betray Him, but delegated that task to S. John,

*now that the care of his brethren has been committed to him, himself questions the Master, whilst S. John is silent ; and not only does not substitute another for himself, but even intervenes in John's behalf and repays his services, supposing that John desired, but did not dare, to ask for himself. . . . The Lord repressed the excessive fervour of Peter. Do not imagine, He says, that I have disposed of you both in the same manner ; nor does it pertain to you to know whether I will that he should remain here or elsewhere until I call him to Myself ; but it is yours to preside over the whole world.'*

It certainly required some ingenuity to extract a renewed assurance of universal authority from a simple rebuke for indiscreet, though natural, curiosity.

Our second illustration is taken from a sermon delivered two years later by Contreras, an Observantine, who filled the office of theologian to the Catholic King, Philip II. He drew a fanciful parallel between a General Council and the Transfiguration,

'at which (*i.e.* the Transfiguration) it was of the highest importance that Peter should be present in order that he might learn there that which he might be able to enjoin with pontifical authority—namely, how in future ages General Councils should be duly and rightly conducted. For there the Lord Christ presided in person, nor did He think it safe to entrust a matter of such vast importance to another. Himself summoned the other members, and by means of the Transfiguration revealed to them the glory of His truth and majesty. The subject of the discussion was not of personal, but of general interest, and the Fathers present (Moses and Elijah are, we presume, intended) treated it in a spirit of grave sincerity and ripe wisdom as they spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem.'

The part which Peter filled at this General Council is curiously explained as follows :—

'Since Peter, inasmuch as he was a man, represented the type of the ambitious and the greedy, he seems in that synod to look only to his own advantage, and incurred accordingly blame for some ignorance and ambition. But presently, being thrown on his face to the earth by the majesty of the Divine voice, by his very posture he confessed that he had erred very grievously.'

We conclude our notice of this branch of our subject with one more brief illustration of the airy audacity displayed so often when S. Peter's name is introduced. G. Cardillus Villipandus, of Segovia, selected the primacy of Peter as his subject on the festival of S. Peter and S. Paul, June 29, 1563. His text was 'Thou art Peter,' &c., and he founds upon it the usual arguments alleged by Roman Catholics in behalf of the fundamental article of their creed. All this is but natural, although we might fairly inquire his authority for the state-

ment that Peter, 'neque modo honore et dignitate ceteros omnes, qui sunt in eadem (*i.e.* ecclesia) longo intervallo exsuperat et antecedit, *sed etiam facultatis regendi et gubernandi proram et puppim tenet.*" But such a flourish of rhetoric is trifling compared with the calm statement which shortly follows it, that in the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem he stood alone as the author of the decision to dispense with the observance of the Mosaic ritual.

We meet with but a single direct reference to the exercise of its powers by the Inquisition, and that, as might be expected, by a Spaniard, John Baptist Burgos, of Valencia. He treated of the four principal remedies against heresy, and considered the most important of them all to be a vigilant scrutiny into the first appearance of any novel opinions. *Principiis obsta* was his motto:—

'By means of this vigilance (God be praised) the disturbances which certain factious persons had excited at Valladolid and Seville had been suppressed. In fact our sovereign lord, Philip, immediately after his return from Flanders into Spain, had displayed the greatest conceivable alacrity and earnestness against this growing pest of heresy. Whence it happened that those who were accused of any avowed heresy before the most righteous tribunal of the Inquisition were speedily either condemned to death and delivered to the flames, or by suffering the punishment of confiscation of their goods and other penalties met with merited retribution for their wickedness and impiety. Nor was the piety and devotion of so mighty a monarch content without deeming it becoming to his royal dignity to grace with his presence that most dread judgment on the day in which the sentence against the heretics of Valladolid was first executed; and so in the sight of almost all the princes of Spain and of the whole realm, he promised on oath perpetual obedience and fealty to the Holy Roman Church, even at the hazard of life and fortune.'

Yet some compassion might have been extended to the victims of the Inquisition even on the preacher's own showing, at least on the plea that their teachers had in many places shamefully neglected their duty. His third remedy against heresy is the more frequent use of preaching, provided only it be such as aims at the benefit of the audience, and not at the vain-glory of the preacher:—

'There are two things—O fathers, hear me, I pray you, the truth must be spoken—which extremely grieve and trouble me, and to which I counsel you, I pray you, I adjure you by the mercies of Jesus Christ, to apply a remedy. One is the fact that in some districts sermons are so rare that except on a Sunday in Lent—and would that even then they were delivered to any good purpose!—

there is little or no preaching during the entire year. The other is the mournful truth that the craft of the devil has so gained over some preachers that they neglect to treat of points which are essential to the people's salvation, and apply all their powers to points of no practical utility, and which are more suitable to the schools than to the pulpit.'

The preacher, however, asserted that hitherto Spain had used this shield of preaching wherewith to protect herself against the infliction of any deadly wound by heretics or schismatics.

The general use of the pulpit by the Protestants, and their constant quotation both of Scripture and the Fathers in support of their opinions, excited no little astonishment amongst a few of the preachers at Trent. To most of them, indeed, all dissentients from the Church of Rome were shameless and abandoned criminals. They were a brood of vipers, the spawn of Satan, the locusts from the bottomless pit, the offspring and the fathers of lies, the incarnation of hypocrisy. The mention of Luther's name was commonly followed or preceded by numerous expletives—such as 'that beast of a Luther,' or 'pity that he did not perish in the thunderstorm which once frightened him so greatly, before he uttered the blasphemies for which he is now suffering unending torments.' The palm of vituperation must be awarded to the author of the following string of epithets applied to the monk of Wittenberg, who is said to be '*decucullatum, audacem, morionem, lascivum, procacem, sacrilegum, superbum, stultum, apostatam, denique hæreticum cinerumque hæresiarcharum, qui apud inferos delitescebant, suscitatore*'—a sentence which must have left the orator, as it does the reader, almost breathless.

We meet twice with a somewhat different estimate. One preacher professes to be well acquainted with the writings of the Reformers. The more he reads them the more is he convinced that the truth is with the Church of Rome. But as their authors are really not ill-versed in Patristic literature, nor altogether ignorant, he has come to the charitable conclusion that they do not believe their own doctrines. Unhappily they are committed, and they fear to lose their influence over the lower orders if they retract and confess their mistake. At a much later date in the history of the Council we have a more subtle theory worked out with considerable care. After a dark picture of the troubles of the time, which are said to be intensified by the fact that the heretics imitated very closely the conduct of the orthodox, the preacher sees in this a fulfilment of what had been fore-

told by that vessel of election, S. Paul;<sup>1</sup> they are false apostles transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. We may accept his testimony to the conduct of the Reformed without admitting his explanation of it.

'They showed' (he says) 'a like spirit to that of the Catholics in their endeavours to sustain their doctrine by references (distorted, of course) to Scripture, in their zeal and energy to propagate their opinions, in the readiness with which they submitted to every kind of torture and persecution; imprisonment, stripes, torture, even death itself they are wont to bear with undaunted spirit, so that you would say that they mastered and surpassed Nature herself; for they voluntarily deliver themselves to the fires, they embrace the cross and the gallows, they testify to their joy by singing in the midst of the flames. Good God! how many myriads are there of heretics who desire to seem ambitious not only of undergoing, but of longing for, various kinds of torments, who, as though suffering for the faith of Christ, hasten to slaughter as to some exquisite banquet!'

In dwelling on his second mark of a true Church, viz. antiquity, he quotes Jerome's words to Origen—words which have a singular force in our own day, which has seen the definition of the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Infallibility of the Pope. '*Tu quisquis es, novorum dogmatum assertor, quæso te, ut parcas Romanis auribus, parcas fidei quæ apostoli voce laudata est. Cur post quadringentos annos docere nos niteris, quod antea nescimus? Cur proferas in medium quod Petrus et Paulus edere noluerunt?*'

There are some curious specimens of pulpit oratory amongst the later sermons in this collection. On Good Friday, 1563, the last year of the Council, Antoine Demochars, Doctor of the Sorbonne, began with the solemn words, 'I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified,' and straightway recounted a list of events which had occurred on a Friday—such as the creation of Eve, the fall of Adam, the Annunciation, and the Incarnation. He sees a symbol of the cross in the mode in which Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, and evolves thirty maledictions from as many verses of the 109th Psalm to correspond with the thirty pieces of silver, the price of our Lord's betrayal. In so uncritical an age it was a pardonable fault that he quotes the spurious sibylline verses as being genuine prophecies which foretold the gall, and the vinegar, and the crown of thorns.

The preacher of the sermon which comes next, and which

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 13.



was delivered on Whit Sunday, is not much happier in handling topics which might serve for edification and in avoiding scholastic subtleties. This orator saw foreshadowings of the doctrine of the Trinity in the primordial and poetic Chaos, Oceanus, Jovialis rigor; in the Pythagorean Monas, Dyas, Trias, &c., and so on through the elemental theories of the Stoic, Academic, and Peripatetic schools of thought. We resist the temptation to quote other eccentric passages, but his explanation of the mystic meaning of the word Pentecost is irresistible: 'In quinquagesimo die completio perfectissimi numeri quadrati, hoc est, septinarii in seipsum ducti designatur. Septies enim septem efficiunt quadraginta novem. Cujus tamen completio ad sequentem pertinet quinquagesimum, *addita monade, quæ presentis sæculi meta et futuri initium, perpetuitatem sub octavæ diei Dominicæ ratione continens, sic præsentia terminat, ut nos ad eterna intromittat.*'

The haste with which the proceedings of the Council were brought to a final conclusion prevented anything like a formal summary of its work in a closing sermon. There are evidences of this haste in remarks upon how little has been effected which occur in discourses delivered during the year 1563, and in the anxiety as to the final issue which fills the minds of the preachers to the last. It is beside our purpose to enter upon the motives which induced Pope Pius IV. and the bishops assembled at Trent equally to desire that the curtain should fall upon a drama which had been before the eyes of Europe for so long a period. We must content ourselves with a brief summary of our task and of the results which we have gathered from it.

The impression produced by a study of this bulky volume admits of being tersely stated. It is only reasonable to suppose that the ablest popular defenders of the Papacy were appointed to preach at Trent, and that the best of their sermons, as the most worthy of preservation, have been handed down in the scattered quarters from whence the diligence of Le Plat gathered them together. In our own presentation of them in the present article we have necessarily omitted much eloquent exhortation and much powerful statement of true doctrine; but except strong though unsupported assertion, these sermons contribute little to the cause they were designed to uphold. The prevailing topics constantly enlarged upon are—1, The Supremacy of Peter; and 2, The immorality and impiety of all dissent from the authority which professed to be derived from him. But perpetual insistence

upon this dogma does not cause them to conceal the fact that almost incredible corruption prevailed within the bosom of that Church which claimed exclusive possession of the truth. So much is avowed in all candour from one end of this volume to the other.

It is therefore all the more astounding to mark, after the perusal of these sermons, how widely the result differed from the hopes and fears of the preachers. Upon the question of dogmatic teaching as determined at the Council of Trent, which was fated to build an impassable wall of separation between large masses of Christians, no fears seem to have crossed their minds. Despite the controversies which raged at times in the Congregations, and which the pages of Fra Paolo and others reveal to us, the Council presented an almost unruffled front to the outer world; and its apparent unanimity was held to be such irresistible proof of its divine inspiration that little apprehension was felt lest its decrees should fail to receive universal acceptance. The fear was, however, both widespread and justifiable that all its success in the elaboration of doctrine would be neutralised by its failure adequately to cope with existing abuses, inasmuch as the conflicting interests at stake prevented a precise and clear declaration by the voice of the Synod of the laws which should regulate many practical questions. But the result in this case, as in so many others, was contrary alike to probability and expectation. Its definition of dogma, so far from meeting general acceptance, only served to widen the separation between Romanist and Protestant; but a reformation of abuses did set in, and the days of the Borgias and Medicis were gone never to return. Of course, the abolition of many scandals was a gradual work, and some countries, and France pre-eminently, for a long season afterwards, presented startling instances of pluralities and other abuses. But, taken as a whole, the Church of Rome, from the days of the Council of Trent, no longer displayed the shameless corruption which had aroused the wrath and kindled the contempt of the age which preceded it. Apart from instances of individual misconduct, the Christian Churches of Europe, diverse in doctrine, were henceforth one in discipline; and the See of S. Peter may date from the damaging flood of light cast upon many of its usurpations, and from their unsparing condemnation by the voice of all Christian Europe, its renewed lease of an immense influence over the convictions and the destinies of millions of mankind.

ART. VII.—THE PRESENT PHASE OF THE  
TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

1. *Tracts for the Times, Advertisement, &c.* (Rivingtons, 1840.) Vol. I., for 1833–1834.
2. *A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the 'Tracts for the Times,' &c.* By Rev. WILLIAM PALMER. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1843.)
3. *Republication of Tract 90, with Introduction.* By Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.
4. *The Church in Baldwin's Gardens; or, History of the first Thirteen Years of the Church of S. Albans.* (T. T. Hayes.)
5. *Twenty-one Years in S. George's Mission.* Rev. C. F. LOWDER. (Rivingtons, 1877.)
6. *Constitution of the Guild of S. Alban the Martyr.* (1873.)

IT cannot be denied that at the present moment we are living in the midst of great excitement on matters pertaining to religion, and because of this excitement, and the hard words with which it is accompanied, those who are now for the first time involved in the great Church revival are apt to look with no small apprehension at the commotion in which they find themselves. There is the old fear of increasing divisions as they see one party threatening secession if it cannot succeed in driving out the other; there is the old cry of conspiracy to Romanise the Church; and there is the old bugbear of State aggression—which those who have witnessed the spiritual revival of the last fifty years, in the face of difficulties compared to which our present circumstances are easy indeed, should ere this have learnt to look upon with comparative calm.

We do not indeed desire to minimise, much less to ignore, any one of these several fears. Each and all of them has a real existence. But what we notice is that side by side with these old causes of fear for the Church of England, her spiritual life runs on in an ever-increasing stream. From the first work of building up as a sure foundation the old primitive faith to which our Reformers appealed, and upon which our Prayer-Book is based, we are now in the midst of the

second portion of the great Tractarian movement, and, if first steps are the greatest steps in any undertaking, then we must be admitted to have gone far towards enlarging our borders and winning back to the Church those great portions of our people who, from past neglect or from direct persecution, have so long lived outside our pale, either among the ranks of our Nonconformists or among the great masses of our people who have in times past been included under the name of 'the alienated classes.'

It is well, at such a time, to look back upon the past and see what was the real position of things at the beginning of the Tractarian movement—what were the real principles at the root of it; how far these principles have progressed, to what they are really tending—and to gather from such a review some words of caution and many of encouragement.

It is curious to see with what fear the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, the Act of Catholic Emancipation, and the Reform Act were viewed as successive blows, each greater than the other, against the Established Church. It is not so much to be wondered at, for the intense and avowed animosity to the Church of the successful supporters of those measures, their exceeding exultation at their success, and the hopes (never to be realised) which they expressed of further mischief, were enough to have excited even greater fears among the beaten party. Mr. Palmer writes:—

'It was then that we felt ourselves assailed by enemies from without and from within, our prelates insulted and threatened by Ministers of State, clamours loud and long for the overthrow of the Church, Dissenters and Romanists triumphing in the prospect of its subversion, and assailing it with every epithet calculated to stimulate popular hatred.

'Nor was this the worst. The prevailing spirit of innovation had begun deeply to infect the Church itself.

'Pamphlets were in wide circulation recommending the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), and especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed, the removal of all mention of the Blessed Trinity, of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, of the practice of absolution. In fact, there was not a single stone of the sacred edifice of the Church which was not examined, shaken, undermined, by a meddling curiosity.

'Such was our condition in the early summer of 1833. We knew not in what quarter to look for support.

'And what was worst of all, no principle in the public mind to which we could appeal—an utter ignorance of all rational grounds of attachment to the Church; an oblivion of its spiritual character as an institution not of man, but of God; the grossest Erastianism most

widely prevalent, especially among all classes of politicians. There was enough in all this to appall the stoutest hearts, and those who can recall the feelings of those days will at once remember the deep depression into which the Church had fallen, and the gloomy forebodings which were universally prevalent.'

It is true we have not won all that we require; but no one can look upon this picture, and then turn his eyes to the very blackest view that can be taken of our present position, without thanking God and taking courage. The mode in which this state of things was proposed to be met by an association of Churchmen of all schools is clearly set forth in an address to Archbishop Howley; and as this declaration was practically the turning point of the popular movement against the Church Establishment, and as its sentiments lie at the root of the Church movement even at the present day, it may be well to give the address in full:—

*'To the Most Reverend Father in God, William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England.'*

'We, the undersigned clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office to which, by Divine Providence, you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger. At a time when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are ministers, and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable liturgy in which she has embodied in the language of ancient piety the orthodox and primitive faith. And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not the less solicitous to declare our firm conviction that, should anything, from the lapse of years or altered circumstances, require renewal or correction, your Grace and our other spiritual rulers may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the clergy in carrying into effect any measures that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between bishops, clergy, and people, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church.'

This petition was signed by 7,000 of the clergy, and a similar address 'for the preservation of this our national Church in the integrity of her rights and privileges, and in her alliance with the State,' obtained 230,000 signatures from

laymen—heads of families alone signing—and was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury in May 1834.

In the autumn of 1833 it was determined to bring out the *Tracts for the Times*. Again to quote from Mr. Palmer :—

‘We thought it necessary to teach people that the duty of adhering to the Church of England rested on a basis somewhat higher than mere Acts of Parliament,’ or the patronage of the State, or individual fancy. We were anxious to impress on them that the Church was more than a merely human institution—that it had privileges, sacraments, a ministry ordained by Christ ; that it was a matter of the highest obligation to remain united to the Church.’

It must never be forgotten that this Tractarian movement itself was but a fresh development of that stream of spiritual life which was the strength of the great Evangelical movement at the latter end of the last century. But for this continuous witness to the need of a Saviour and the necessity of a true conversion, it is hard to understand how English religion should have escaped utter destruction under the crushing Erastianism of the Georgian era. Without such a fertilising stream to enrich the parched and withered pastures of our Sion, the beautiful music of the *Christian Year*, with all its simple yet mighty teaching, would have awakened no sympathetic chords, and the work of the early Tractarians in their endeavours to revive the full teaching of the Prayer-Book, with its appeal to primitive antiquity, would scarcely have had anything to appeal to. In like manner, it would have been impossible to bring the Gospel successfully and permanently home to the neglected masses of our people until the Church in all her members had become imbued with that primitive doctrine and practice to which our Reformers had appealed, and which it was the chief object of the Tractarian movement to revive amongst us.

This sure Catholic foundation was essential to prevent the Evangelical movement itself from drifting into a purely sectarian one ; and this alone provided the way for a fresh aggression upon the masses of our people without risk of losing the sure standpoints of the Catholic Faith.

Those who have lived through the first half of the Tractarian movement can remember with what dread we looked upon any the slightest transgression of Church order—opposing preaching in unconsecrated buildings or in the open air, opposing all unauthorised hymns or shortened services, from an instinctive feeling, arising from the revelations of the past, that it would be dangerous to permit them until the



Church was fully imbued with the meaning of all Prayer-Book teaching, and had learnt to base all her work on the sure foundation of Catholic truth.

But, now that that teaching has been brought home to all, and that the One Offering has become the centre of all our ministrations, we are in a position to unite with our brethren of the Evangelical school in the work of special missions, in out-of-door preaching, and in the permission of duly organised lay ministrations without fear.

It will be well to make clear here that the tendency and first intention of the Tractarian movement was not only to restore primitive practice and teaching amongst us, but to enlarge materially the scope and action of our Church, and to restore primitive unity also. This is clearly seen in Mr. Palmer's narrative, p. 18; for he writes at a very early period :—

'One more result of our efforts, however, must not be passed over in silence. I can sincerely say that, if there was one object more than another which we should have been happy to realise, it was the *union of the Church*. Separated as we were from party feeling and associations, we only looked for the general good.

'How great, then, was our rejoicing to find that, in the course of our exertions, men of different theological schools were brought nearer together, were inspired with feelings of mutual respect and esteem, and were convinced that religion and religious truth were more widely extended than they had been accustomed to think. The wounds of the Church were every day healing with the balm of brotherly love.'

The long-forgotten Advertisement to the *Tracts for the Times*, written on All Saints' Day, 1834, distinctly verifies this position :—

'The Church of Christ was intended to cope with human nature in all its forms; and surely the gifts vouchsafed it are adequate for that gracious purpose. There are zealous sons and servants of her English branch who see with sorrow that she is defrauded of her full usefulness by particular theories and principles of the present age, which interfere with the execution of one portion of her commission; and, while they consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union between all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines faithfully preached will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too surely preparing the way.'

How nearly this end was attained those in the thick of the movement well know; how tares were sown among the

wheat, and worldly animosities and jealousies and party spirit were brought in to hinder, and yet, in God's marvellous providence, to extend and further, the work, while deferring its full accomplishment to a later time, we well know also.

We have considered above the outward aspect of affairs as affecting the Established Church, and the remedies applied. It is necessary that we should shortly sketch the state of things then going on in many parishes within the Church which gave at that time too sure a mark for the scoffing satire of our opponents.

To take the actual history of one parish :—floating in the memory of the past comes the old-fashioned country vicar, who, starting from the school-grounds, which he considered his lawful heritage, poached on the neighbouring manors, whilst the Wesleyans visited his neglected flock. He always resided in his kitchen, and rewarded the young man who married the daughter of his housekeeper with the appointment of schoolmaster, for which office he cheerfully combined the knowledge of reading and writing with a love of gambling and of the ale-house. Then came a pluralist and non-resident, who sent curates, lazy and luxurious, pompous and idle, formal and of questionable antecedents, and finally one openly immoral; until a warm-hearted Evangelical, with earnest sermons, cottage lectures, and monthly Communion, took away the reproach, and did his best to build up a true religion in the parish.

But what a place he had to work in—a cold, damp church mouldy and ruinous, with a font under the gallery full of rubbish, a mean table for an altar, with a threadbare altar-cloth, though of red velvet, thus bearing witness to the Old Sarum colours; box pews lined some with green, or red, or blue baize, according to the taste or liveries of the various squires. A few texts on the whitewashed walls, which could be read by small eyes from the bottom of the pew, helping to check the wandering thoughts which were always started anew by some incident, or look, among the occupants of the family pew. A gallery occupied by irreverent, noisy singers, with their own tunes to Tate and Brady, and a clerk who gave out from over the King's arms the amount of poor-rate to be levied in the parish. No frequent Communion, no baptisms in church, no saint's-day or daily services; and yet we had and we valued our Prayer-Book in those days; and beside many a solitary hearth, in many a grievously neglected parish, the faith was thus kept alive firm and true, and the way prepared for the full acceptance of that Prayer-Book

teaching by which this past neglect was to be swept away. As to the Church at large, though there was much earnest work here and there, non-residence, and pluralities, and triennial confirmations had become a by-word and a disgrace.

Again we pause to ask, though we have not yet got all that we require to make our varying services acceptable to all classes of our people, who can look on this picture and the very worst that can be found at the present time without a feeling of devout thankfulness?

To meet this state of things within the Church, the work of the Tractarians was called forth—to make the services a real worship; to rebuild, as the outward type of renewed inward growth, the waste places of our Sion—*Donec templam refeceris*—to supplant Tate and Brady's parody of the psalms by hymns translated from the old service books, sanctified by the use of a catena of saints from Apostolic times, and joined to the songs of saints of a later period.

Surely it is not to be wondered at that in so vast a work some mistakes should have been made and many misunderstandings should have arisen. At first, as we have shown above, all earnest-minded men felt thankful for the movement, and at least gave it their tacit approval; but the Erastian and the idler looked with dread upon it, and eagerly seized on any mistakes to point at Catholic revival as a conspiracy to Romanise the Church. Hence party spirit was revived with all its old bitterness and intolerance. This, as it always does, stimulated zeal on the other side. The heated attack on one side resulting in an indiscriminating advocacy on the other. A desire for greater unity led on to an explaining away of the differences between us and Rome, against which the first leaders of the movement protested in vain. Many who from their early religious training had never realised the Church as a living reality, lost their balance and began the Roman secession, while others, notwithstanding the rapidity with which amendments were made, were unable to stand against the exposures of past neglect and unrealities which the unfolding of the real teaching of the Prayer-Book brought into more prominent contrast.

Against such men as these, whose misgivings were made apparent in the later numbers of the *British Critic*, Mr. Palmer, in his narrative, gives a hearty protest, and reveals a real tendency to Roman teaching at that period, compared with which our present fears in that direction are as nothing. Amidst all this, even after the publication of Tract 90, which was written in order to check the Romanising tendencies,

Dr. Newman stood firm, until the bishops, whom we had been taught to reverence as the heads of the Church, in each diocese joined the popular cry, and charged so vehemently against Tract 90 as to drive Newman and others out of the Church—at first, at all events, sorely against their will. Nevertheless, notwithstanding all hindrances, the work prospered; services multiplied, churches in large numbers were built and repaired, the Colonial episcopate was laid upon a large and sound basis. The home bishops and clergy as one man rose to the importance of their spiritual duties, while the voluntary offerings of the clergy and laity made our richly endowed Church to take her place among the first of voluntary associations.

The Erastians were astonished at the amount of life exhibited by clergy and people in the Hampden and Gorham cases, and in the resolute demand for the restoration of the convocations of both provinces.

And now the time had come, our foundation having been made secure, for more direct and permanent efforts by home missionary work upon that rapidly rising portion of our people included under the designation of working man and artisan.

After the retrospect of past work, with all its trials and blessings, it is not to be wondered at that when we come to the history of this later portion of the great movement we should find ourselves launched at once into the very midst of the old controversies, the same desires to thrust one another out of the Church by narrowing instead of lengthening her borders, the same cry of conspiracy and of attempts to Romanise the Church. It is true that in working out the full meaning of the Prayer-Book in her services and ritual many have gone far beyond what the original Tractarians ever dreamt of, though they are professedly carrying out the same teaching; and though they stand up *ex animo* as the old Tractarians did for the Prayer-Book as they understand it in its truest literal and historical meaning. Very few of them, indeed, will be found to have any *arrière pensée* for the Church of Rome. It is true that, under the excitement of party rancour and persecution, there are some who openly advocate Disestablishment. And then, somewhere or other, we do not know exactly where or what it is, there is the mysterious Order of Corporate Reunion, which, according to its manifesto, accepts the Council of Trent as a starting-point, and therefore virtually abandons the position of the Anglican Church. But the real danger of Romanising is manifestly less than it was in the days of William Palmer's protest. It

was possible at that time to imagine a reconciliation even with Rome on a fair basis, and men anxious for reunion were led to overstep the barrier and make the concessions all on one side. Now, since the promulgation of the Vatican Decrees, as has been so clearly pointed out by Dr. Pusey, the prospect of such a reconciliation is postponed for ages. The animosity of the Church of Rome towards the movement has become marked and bitter, and, however much opponents may desire to see our extreme Ritualists quietly transfer themselves to the ranks of the enemy, there is very little prospect indeed of such uncharitable desires being gratified.

Again, a comparison between the past and present condition of things will go far to mitigate the fear of Erastianism which is now so prominent in many minds. Five and forty years ago the State was triumphant with a new and popular representation, full of a desire for reform, and the Church, from its connexion with the Tory party, shared with it the odium of past abuses and of present defeat. Now, the Church has found those things that were supposed to be to her hurt were but a sure advance to renewed life and towards the enlargement of her influences among those who had been alienated from her. If her full and legitimate voice may yet be for a time impeded, her very vigour will render it impossible for the State really to hinder her work or to check her usefulness among the people.

Past experience also enables us to see, through the dust and mist of present controversy, a truer chance of union amongst ourselves than has been realised since the first beginning of the movement. Nevertheless there is no concealing the fact that, for the moment, the successful enlargement of the Church's borders—this opening of the door to the alienated masses, as revealed to us in the simple story of the *Twenty-one Years at S. Peter's Mission*—becomes, in the eyes of many, a byword and a reproach, a renewed cause of contention and strife, instead of being an incentive to that united action in brotherly love against a common enemy which it was designed to call forth and foster.

The account of S. Vincent de Paul's efforts at a revival of the Church in France called forth a similar desire among many of our own clergy, and the first direct attempt among the masses upon these lines had been successfully inaugurated at S. Barnabas, Pimlico, and a fresh movement was begun in the apparently hopeless district round the London docks, in a portion of the parish of S. George's in the East, soon to obtain unenviable notoriety as the scene of the surplice and vest-

ments riots which were carried on even within the very church itself.

The lawlessness, immorality, and poverty of the district had become proverbial.

Dr. Liddon's sermon at the first anniversary very clearly points out the principle at the root of all their endeavours as 'the bringing to bear upon the masses the individualising spirit of the Church.'

'Although the Church throws herself upon the masses, she deals with each individual soul as if it alone were entitled to all her labour and all her love; never while the Church has comprehended her mission has she affected to win souls by general measures which ignore the individual needs of each. The soul of man is not a mere part of a machine, which moves because you set it in motion. It is a living force, a centre of undying life.'

Again,

'The Good Shepherd calleth His sheep by name. Individualising work is a matter not of taste, but of necessity. A religion which does not attempt this may succeed in adding to the stores of the understanding; it can never win the heart. It may cover the wounds of society, it can never bind and heal.'

And then he says of this mission :—

'It has not attempted the mere civilisation of the many; it has attempted the actual salvation of some.

'The S. George's clergy live in the centre of a dense population; they are always on the spot. They are ready to make the most of every opening, and to guard against each threatening danger. They are surrounding themselves with services, schools, reformatories. They are winning penitents and gathering in communicants. Their object is not only to diffuse an influence, but in the name and in the strength of Christ to save. Around them are those who have been saved, saved from lies, and prayerlessness and lust, and despair, and hell. Such, of course, may fall away and be lost, as may any Christian on this side the grave. But as it is, God "has called them to this state of salvation" by the entreaties, and toils, and sacraments of the S. George's mission clergy. He will call others.'

The following is an outline of the way in which the work has been carried on—

1. The mission priests live together, thus bringing the influence of religious association to bear on the sin and misery of this closely packed population.

2. An organised sisterhood takes charge of the girls and Sunday schools, superintends the penitentiary, visits the sick in their own homes, and follows them, if need be, into the poor-house or the hospital.



3. There is a systematic teaching of the children by weekly catechising, attendance at the celebrations of the Holy Sacrament, with so earnest and careful a preparation of catechumens for confirmation that the majority so presented have generally continued constant and steadfast communicants.

4. Free use is made of confession and absolution, as a sure means of confirming the penitent and building him up in a more perfect knowledge of the love and power of the Atonement.

5. Guilds and confraternities are formed for the purpose of binding the communicants together, giving them simple work to do for Christ, and maintaining a voluntary discipline among them.

6. And, finally, the Church is free and open at all times, with a high ritual, which appears to be thoroughly appreciated by the mass of the people.

Thus armed, like a thoroughly well-manned and well-organised ambulance corps, they are ready at any time to bring their individualising influence to bear upon each member of the district, as bereavement or disease, or any sudden shock, comes, as God's call to each individual or family.

Thus the sudden death of some men in a sewer is made the opportunity for preaching out of doors to the survivors, and to the crowds assembled round the scene of the accident. The funeral of a loved curate or sister is similarly utilised. Visitations, such as in seasons of great distress from strikes or want of work, or of cholera (which, when it came with all the suddenness of an unexpected battle, called forth all their energies, but never called in vain), were blessed as occasions for increasing the influence of religion upon individuals under their various trials, and thus bringing home many souls unto God. So effectually has assistance been rendered that all have appreciated the power of the work and the self-denying power of the workers.

The effect on the rest of the district of the example of the communicants thus won to Christ is forcibly described in the following extract:—

‘A faithful communicant is not only living for God's glory himself, but is influencing others also far more than he is aware; so that the religious power which the Church exerts in the parish and neighbourhood must not be measured merely by the numbers of our communicants or congregation, but is seen in the restraint which they exercise upon sin, and the encouragement which they afford to the cultivation of religion and virtue in those around them.’

Thus a leaven of Christianity has been brought to bear

upon a district before wholly given up to sin and uncleanness, and an earnest and devoted love to God and His Church has been stirred up among classes before wholly alienated.

If we turn to the *Thirteen Years at Baldwin's Gardens* we see the same work equally blessed by apparently the same means. For the energetic incumbent of S. Alban's was chosen from his successful labours in S. Peter's district to inaugurate this equally important work; and whatever may be said in reference to his discretion as regards controverted points of ritual in his church, there can be no question as to the enormous moral and religious influence he has brought to bear upon his district and its inhabitants. Whenever the same means have been used, as at S. Barnabas, Oxford, or in other dense populations, the same result has been attained, in so much that the Church artisan has become as great a reality as the Conservative working man, whose existence was for so long a time looked upon as an impossibility and a chimæra.

Such are the facts clearly revealed to us as the results of this later phase of the Tractarian movement, not as a casual success, but as the permanent and continuous results of many years of careful working.

There is no doubt the Church had become, from various causes in her past history, too much the Church of the then dominant classes and their more immediate dependents; and in deciding upon the hours and order and forms of the services their tastes and requirements have been mainly, if not exclusively, considered. There is no doubt that from similar causes in times past the Church had become too much the Church of a party or denomination, whose duty it was primarily to make war on all other denominations—Roman, or Wesleyan, or Independent, or Baptist—really on political though professedly on so-called religious grounds.

The sooner we get out of these narrow forms, and become more truly Catholic and all-embracing, the better for her usefulness as the Church of this great people. But the question before us is, how far these attempts to bring about such results may be fairly accepted as one among many means by which this desirable end may be attained. The popular cry at the present time sets it all aside as a deep-laid conspiracy to Romanise the Church. Is all this to be ignored as utterly incompatible with the teaching of the Reformed Church? or may we be permitted to rank it among the most successful efforts yet made to enlarge her borders, and to make her in very truth what she has ever professed to be, the Church of all the people?

The question is a momentous one. The whole future of the Church of England depends upon the answer, and the consideration of it claims serious and impartial handling, uninfluenced by the passing craze of the moment or by any party feelings of favour or of prejudice.

We have already attempted to show that the Romanising influence at the present time is as nothing to the same influences within the Church movement in the years 1842-43, while the opposition of the Roman Catholics themselves is most bitter. This is manifest in any correspondence, or sermon, or public address, by Roman Catholic ruler or priest against this school—a pretty clear proof, disguise it as they may, that they do not wish it well—and it goes far to prove the truth of the rumour that many of the anonymous articles in the daily papers on *The Priest in Absolution*, and on *The Confessional as practised in the English Church*, were from Roman Catholic authors. It was, to say the least, singular that the teaching and advice of Cardinal Manning or Monsignor Capel on this subject should have been so uniformly applauded by the Protestant daily press. Again, in these districts there is very little opposition except among the Irish Roman Catholics. It was only on a Sunday in July 1877, that Mr. Lowder and two lay friends were pelted with stones by an Irish mob who had assembled with drum and fife to welcome the Cardinal at the laying the first stone of a Roman Catholic chapel. The feeling on that occasion of the Churchmen of the district, as personified by the people's churchwarden and his son, was as anti-Roman as the most uncompromising Protestant would desire. Let us, however, go a little more thoroughly into the matter, and consider in turn three of the most prominent of the means used in carrying out these successful efforts—1st, confession; 2nd, confraternities or guilds; 3rd, what is called high ritual, with the doctrines it embodies.

And first, as to confession. It may be well to see what Mr. Lowder says of it, and his plea on its behalf:—

‘When the soul is touched with contrition, and anxious to make her peace with God, we recommend sacramental confession, and have reason to be most thankful that this has been our practice from the beginning. With the many instances we could adduce of God's blessing abundantly poured out, and constantly following this holy ordinance of the Church, we should have been unfaithful alike to our vows, and to the souls committed to us, if we ever allowed any outward opposition to wrest from our hands this powerful weapon against the enemy of souls.

'When we see how all earnest denominations of Christians, such as the Wesleyans, and all who hold more or less with their views of conversion, feel the need of some ordinance answering to special confession, it is a matter of wonder that any who are acquainted with the difficulty of dealing with souls, especially in the most trying of all times, their reconciliation with their heavenly Father, should depreciate the help of confession; or that those who have experienced, as surely many have, how defective conversion often is, how unreal, deceptive and fitful, and at best, how imperfect in leading to the higher gifts of God's graces, should swell the popular cry against the blessed ordinances of confession and absolution.'

Now, we object at once to the party name of 'sacramental confession,' as unnecessary and certain to give offence and to create misunderstanding; but here, it may be remarked, there is nothing of the popular view of its importance as a means of priestly exaltation. It is put forward as having been found of much use in the early stages of the mission. And we may conclude that, if mainly confined to that, few would object to its use. In fact, under another name, both the Wesleyans and the great Evangelical party acknowledge the fact that there is little chance of true, permanent conversion without the speaking of soul to soul and careful training to keep the awakened conscience in the right faith without fear or wavering. Thus far we might go together; and few would think it wise, or in accordance with the teaching of our Church, to keep the convert, when fully confirmed in the faith, from a trust in his own individual responsibility, lest by an enforcement of systematic confession the act should become formal, or end in the casting of all responsibility on the advice of a spiritual guide.

All must allow that many abuses have followed the compulsory use of habitual confession in mediæval times, and none can make light of the danger of a large extension of the system in a Church which provides no safeguard either by a special education of the priesthood or by a formal recognition of duly qualified confessors. The fears, however, entertained by many of the direct abuses of the past, or of the indirect increase thus given to the power of the priesthood, are surely greatly exaggerated. The laity are no longer ignorant and uneducated; and with the departure of lay ignorance departs also the danger of priestly encroachment. With us, and more especially in the parishes of which we write, these very laity are taking a most active part in Church work, and by means of guilds form a strong body which, though prepared to work with the clergy, have no intention of being unduly domineered

over by them. There is no doubt that the liberty so clearly provided by our Church to all her members requiring spiritual guidance, must be carefully preserved. In these days, when young people are in the habit of throwing off all parental control, such guidance may be often needed. It is humiliating to note how many, in their zeal against the supposed dangers, have complacently played into Roman Catholic hands, by allowing that they alone have the power of the keys, the possession of which is, whatever it may mean, a sure test of a true Church, and is authoritatively put forth by our own Church in that light both in her Ordination and other services.

The unseemly accusation that the introduction of the confessional is a conspiracy to undermine the morals of our youth, brings with it its own refutation to all those who have the privilege of personal acquaintance with the characters of the men thus grievously maligned. Those who heard Mr. Lowder's address to his people in answer to these bitter attacks, and the hearty reassuring cheers from old and young of both sexes, will not easily forget the depth and reality of feeling shown both by him and the flock who have known him so long.

The influence of guilds requires but a short notice, though the history of one Society supplies a warning, lest the unwise acts of a dominant section become virtually binding on all the members. The importance, however, of such associations as a means for at once supplying a voluntary discipline and an organisation of systematic work for communicants of all classes, cannot be too much exaggerated. And it would be most unwise to forego these advantages because of evils which, once revealed, can be guarded against, and which could soon be effectually remedied, like some other evils to which we may refer, so soon as Churchmen have learnt to work together in brotherly love, thus guiding and influencing one another instead of attempting forcibly to bend those who differ to their own special views. On this point we would refer our readers to the constitution of the guild of S. Alban, which as a purely lay guild has for some years united many hard-headed practical laymen in different parts of the kingdom in a manly defence of their bishops and clergy and of the Apostolic teaching of the Church.

The third important feature in the work is the prominent part which a significant ritual has taken in it. Mr. Lowder writes:—

‘Surely those who know the trials and hardships of the working classes, the dreariness of their homes, the dark and cheerless sur-

roundings of their work, and the few innocent pleasures which are within their reach, cannot deny them the gratification to be derived from the one bright spot in their neighbourhood. To many the Church is their only quiet retreat, the daily sacrifice or service the one happy occupation; all that they have to soothe and cheer them in the privations of a hard life. Nor ought the clergy themselves or the sisters to be lost sight of altogether, giving up, as they must, the comforts and recreations of ordinary life, and struggling, not only against the physical, but also against the spiritual and moral difficulties by which they are surrounded.

'Festival seasons duly observed; vestments, processions, lights, incense, choral services, flowers, pictures; music—grand, hearty, and inspiring; the details of ceremonial carried out carefully and reverently;—these accessories of worship are the rightful claim of the clergy and people of such a church as S. Peter's; and they are appreciated by them. The people love and glory in their church. It is their home—it is God's—but it is also theirs—and they feel a just pride in its adornment and in the improvement of its services.'

And yet, notwithstanding this witness to its practical use, we are met again by the popular denunciation of it as essentially Roman.

From our present point of view we may at once put aside all questions of Church law, or of the binding character of various legal decisions, which have all been ably handled in previous articles of this Review, because, in considering the relation of the Church to this whole people, we can find no stand-point from which to deny to any one section of our people that form of service which experience has shown to be best adapted to their needs, provided always that it involves nothing antagonistic to the teaching of the Reformed Church. This, of course, is a matter for discussion; but this being granted, those who have found it useful have a fair ground for asking that, if at present it be not strictly legal, then it should be made so permissively. Two facts immediately confront us—(1st) that the courts of law have undoubtedly allowed the right to teach that very doctrine of a real presence which this ritual is specially designed to symbolise; (2nd) that the Lutheran Churches, especially in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, have always retained the significant part of that ritual, while clearly maintaining their original Protestant character; and, moreover, history shows us that our own Reformed Church held many of these things to be lawful, and it was not till the ranks of our Reformers had been increased by the accessions of some persecuted French Calvinists that our Church ceased to use them. These statements would go far to show that such forms of service cannot be reasonably



objected to as being essentially anti-Protestant. All are agreed that no alteration of their accustomed services should be forced on unwilling congregations, just as no Churchman dreams of enforcing confession before the reception of the holy mysteries; but as we cannot, in making this latter protest, give up the inalienable right of all who are so moved to seek for spiritual guidance, so we have no right to charge disloyalty to the Church upon those who ask for such services as cannot be shown to be contrary to the faith of our Reformed Church.

Nevertheless a calm consideration of many late proceedings must pronounce emphatically against the way in which these innovations have been originally introduced, often in much ignorance of the old law of the Church and of the inapplicability of many obsolete customs to the rationale of our present mode of worship, and persevered in, in defiance of the decisions of the courts of law, which the accused had recognised by their appeal. The true security against such wanton extravagances is the counteracting influence of that mass of common sense which is to be found in abundance among the majority of that great party which has formed the stamina and backbone of the movement all along. For the present nothing has done more harm than the way in which the cooler judgment of the majority has been prevented from making itself felt, by the very violence of the unreasoning and unscrupulous spirit of persecution which has been evinced by opponents.

For, as Mr. Palmer forcibly puts it—

‘we shrank from being made the instruments of party hate, from seeing our language perverted and distorted to ends the most remote from our intention, perhaps to the assault of truths which we held most dear and sacred, or to the destruction of brethren whose principal fault seemed to be indiscretion, and whose faults were more than balanced by their merits and their services.’

By working together in a spirit of brotherly love, we should correct each others’ extravagances in a much more effectual way than by any system of narrowness and bigotry, which is a disgrace not only to Christianity, but to the spirit of the age in which we live. The time has come for higher aspirations. The Church of England, in her Prayer-Book and in her Articles, recognises the full breadth and largeness of her communion. Political considerations alone have induced her to contract her bounds by enforcing uniformity upon many who, holding the Church’s creeds, are undoubtedly

members of the universal Church of Christ. It is a time for comprehension rather than for fresh division. Our true work now, if we would make a sure stand against Roman aggression, is to become more and more the source of all religious teaching to this great people, meeting the various wants of all religious minds by varying but properly regulated services—in a word, by an enlargement of our borders on the basis of primitive Catholic truth. Thus should we best be carrying out to their true end the principles of the *Tracts for the Times*, which must eventually issue in the breaking up of existing parties in the Church and forming instead a bond of union between all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE WAR BETWEEN RUSSIA AND TURKEY.

SINCE the publication of our last number a 'preliminary peace' (whatever that may mean) has been negotiated between Russia and Turkey, and not only so, but the strife of parties in our own land, which was raging for awhile with a vehemence scarcely inferior to that which animated the actual combatants on the Balkans or the Caucasus, has in great measure subsided. We may now, therefore, not unprofitably review the leading events of the conflict, and, so far as men who are neither soldiers nor diplomatists may, seek to inquire whether the warriors and, still more, the politicians of Europe may not derive from them some useful lessons or warnings. Of the causes of the war we will say as little as possible, touching, as such, only on facts which are indisputable. It was a war, then, in which obviously and avowedly the Russians took the initiative, and that in spite of the strongest protest from more than one Government, and especially from our own. It was a war, too, which had been preceded by not a few intrigues on the part of the Russians in the territories across their borders, and we believe that no Russian politician makes any secret of the connexion between these proceedings and the Bulgarian insurrection, upon which these protests were based.

What followed is known to all; the exasperation and panic of the Turkish authorities, and the inhuman atrocities

by which they sought to restore submission to their power. However much men might feel the truth of what the Turks might allege regarding Russian interference, still the most strenuous upholders of the doctrine that the independence of the Porte was indispensable to the maintenance of the balance of power could not say a word in defence of their mode of action; and Lord Derby addressed to the Turkish Minister a reproof which, while in its calm dignity it was worthy of the representative of England, was yet so stern an expression of indignant censure as had probably never before been addressed from one Government to another except as a herald of war.

This denunciation was echoed by the whole nation, and, though scarcely with equal openness, by every Cabinet in Christendom. All Europe was of one mind as to the necessity of preventing a recurrence of such atrocities as had laid waste whole districts in Bulgaria; but the difference between Russia and other nations lay in this, that, while the latter trusted to peaceful means, to conferences and diplomatic representations, which were not the less likely to obtain a favourable hearing, that they showed some respect for the dignity and authority of the Sultan, Russia alone avowed a determination to enforce instant compliance with her demands at the point of the sword. As in 1853, she asserted a special right to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan, though there were not wanting reasons for believing that the prelates of the Greek Church in the Turkish dominions were far from desiring her protection,<sup>1</sup>—a protection which was repulsive to the national church of independent Greece—while a second pretext for energetic action was found in her assumption of the character of the champion of humanity, an assumption not altogether in harmony with people's recollections of Poland, Sinope, and the more recent

<sup>1</sup> In his admirable account of Turkey in Europe (noticed towards the end of this number of the *C. Q. R.*), Col. James Baker relates that a few years ago some 'wealthy merchants from Philippopolis and other districts' endeavoured to establish schools, and 'to introduce the Bulgarian language and literature into the local schools and churches.' With this object, 'as there was an absence of Bulgarian printing presses in Turkey,' they imported from foreign countries a number of books; but 'no sooner were they landed than the Patriarch instantly hurried to the Porte and obtained the confiscation of all the Bibles and books, representing most artfully that these works, being in the Slavic language, were a proof of Bulgarian sympathy with Russia; and that their importation was but the first act of rebellion.'—(Chap. ii. p. 35). The whole chapter relates a number of instances of the share Russian intrigue had in causing the late outbreak.

massacres of General Kauptmann on the Volga, or of the victims of both sexes who perish beneath the knout.

We need not dwell on the Conference which was held at Constantinople ; on the Protocols which were drawn up ; on the notes which were exchanged or rejected. It could serve no useful purpose now to revive the memory of controversies which have already become obsolete, of reproaches on one side and recriminations on the other. But it is impossible to omit the unexpected pledge on the part of Turkey of the willingness of her then Government to remove causes of complaint in every part of her dominions. In apparent abandonment of all the old principles of despotism, the Sultan promulgated a Constitution, the benefits of which were proclaimed as extending to all his provinces in Europe and Asia, and as conferring privileges hitherto undreamt of on all classes of his subjects, whatever might be their religion. And Europe beheld with astonishment a Parliament of representatives discussing with freedom of speech the condition of the empire and measures for the reform of abuses, the existence of which their government itself admitted and deplored. When, therefore, the Sultan rejected the summary demands put forth by the Western and Northern Powers at the Conference, he was not without a plausible plea for respite, on the ground that time should be given for his people themselves to deliberate on their own requirements ; and that the very convocation of a Parliament with such powers should be taken as a pledge and proof that the old system of absolute despotism with all its concomitant evils was renounced. Appearances were on his side to plead that he had shown that a peaceful solution of the difficulties of his empire was possible, and that the Constitution which he had granted was, in fact, a conciliatory measure exceeding any that his severest critics had proposed. For this peaceful solution of the difficulties of the situation no opportunity was vouchsafed ; and it is doubtful how far any respite could have been obtained for Turkey, when even Prince Bismarck, the statesman whose judgment weighed most with Russia, affirmed in the most distinct and positive manner that 'the Imperial Government could not have hindered the outbreak of the war.'<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, on April 24, Russia declared war, while striving to render the act less unpalatable to England, France, and Austria, by the assurance that she aimed at no extension of her territories ; that she did not propose to conquer and

<sup>1</sup> See his reply to Herr Windthorst in the debate on Tuesday, Feb. 19.

annex a single province of Turkey. She did not, indeed, bind herself to strip none of her own allies, if she should obtain any, of any portion of their lands. It would have seemed superfluous to repudiate the idea of aggrandisement at the expense of her friends.

No time was lost in taking the first steps to give effect to the declaration of war. On the same day that it was issued a Russian division of nearly 20,000 men crossed the Pruth and commenced its advance towards the Danube. But the rupture of peace had been for some weeks so clearly foreseen that it can hardly be said that the intelligence that it was actually broken produced any great additional excitement in England. Lord Derby, when he announced the fact in the House of Lords, did so in the briefest terms, regretting that our efforts to prevent it had been vain, but expressing his deep conviction that 'in endeavouring to maintain peace between the combatants we had been engaged in the solution of an insoluble problem.'<sup>1</sup> But to the Court of St. Petersburg itself he addressed a vigorous protest against its conduct, a protest which was certainly echoed by the general feeling of the English people. The *Times* for once did represent the public opinion when, in its article of the 25th, it set forth an indictment of the Russian policy which, while studiously moderate in language, was severe indeed in the charges which it made, and sustained by the clearest proof, that the Russian Government had first given just offence to Turkey by the 'covert aid' which it had given to insurrections, and had since, by the imperiousness of its menaces, sought to exasperate the whole Turkish people, and make concessions from them absolutely impossible. It was, as the writer truly declared, the threats of the Czar throughout the winter which were the real declaration of war, for they prevented Russia from accepting anything less than the complete submission of Turkey; and they so helped to inflame the pride and the fanaticism of the Turks that such a surrender might have cost the Sultan his throne, his Ministers their lives. Russia had acted as if she 'wished to cut off a way of retreat both from herself and her foe,' and by her conduct 'had forfeited any right to speak in the name of Europe.'

But if people had been so prepared for the outbreak of war between the two nations as in one point of view to receive the intelligence calmly, there was another aspect of the case which it was impossible to regard with equal indifference: the

<sup>1</sup> Speech of April 24.

question whether any other nation would be involved in it, and especially whether we ourselves, to whom our vast commerce and our long-standing and complicated diplomatic relations gave a peculiar interest in Eastern politics, were in danger of being drawn into it. Here, however, the judgment of the Government coincided with that of the great majority of the people. It was one of those cases in which our duty and our interest fortunately led us in the same direction. Our interest was clearly peace; and our duty equally forbade us to range ourselves on the side of either antagonist. Lord Derby's indignant reproof of the cruelties practised by the Turks would have been mere hypocrisy if we had become the active allies of a Power capable of those atrocities. His equally vigorous protest against the conduct of Russia as needlessly and wantonly provoking and plunging into war, equally forbade our taking any part in a policy we so emphatically condemned. Accordingly we from the first announced our resolution to maintain an absolute neutrality between the combatants. And as, if we had embarked in the conflict, the other nations of Western Europe could hardly have failed to become involved in it also, so the proclamation of our wise and resolute determination enabled the other Governments to adhere to the same line of action with confidence. And the result has been the entire localisation (to use a word of recent coinage) of the war, and a limitation of its horrors to a comparatively small district.

Another question which was discussed in every company with scarcely inferior eagerness was what might be expected to be the result of the campaign; which way probabilities seemed to incline; would the Russians be able to crush the Turks, or would the Turks succeed in repelling their invasion? for it seemed certain that the Sultan's troops would confine their exertions to the defence of their own country. And on this point the opinions of those who were able to form a judgment may be said to have agreed more than on any other part of the subject. Those of our officers who had seen both armies in the war of 1854 entertained, so far as we could gather, little doubt that man for man the Turkish soldiery was the better; that 10,000 Turks well commanded would prove decidedly superior to an equal number of Russians. But they had little faith in Turkish generalship; equally little in the power of the Sultan's government to secure concert in their operations; while it seemed as if the systematic training which every Russian officer underwent could hardly fail to produce some commanders who, if not



equal to Moltke, or even to MacMahon, would at least display professional skill which would more than counterbalance the physical superiority of the Turkish soldier. The Russians, too, would have a vast superiority in numbers. Turkish statistics are not very trustworthy, but the general calculation was that the subjects of the Czar must be something like threefold the number of those of the Sultan; and in the end numbers must prevail. The only advantages which the Turks had to countervail this superiority of military skill and numbers which was marshalled against them were the command of the sea, and the fact that, as fighting in their own country, they would be nearer their supplies. But, important as these considerations undoubtedly were, they were not generally regarded as redressing the balance. And, on the whole, the best that the most sanguine partisans of the Turks could venture to hope was that by the aid of the Danube, the Balkans, and their famous quadrilateral, they might be able to protract the contest till the winter set in; which, by compelling a cessation from military operations, might afford an opening for judicious mediation.

The result of the campaign has so far corresponded to these calculations that Russian numbers have eventually prevailed; but, during the first months of warfare, the Russian Government was so far from displaying any superiority of capacity in organisation or administration, the Russian generals were so far from surpassing their antagonists in either strategic or tactical skill, that in the majority of operations conducted during the summer and autumn the advantage was indisputably on the side of the Turks. So that the Czar himself began to despair of finishing the contest in a single campaign, and to make ostentatious preparations for establishing his army in winter-quarters in Bulgaria and Roumania, with the design of resuming operations on a larger scale in the spring of 1878. It is not improbable that he had trusted that the mere declaration of war, combined with the conviction that they could expect active support and assistance from no other nation, would alarm the Turks into submission to his demands. At all events he was so far from being in a condition to give instant effect to his declaration that two months elapsed before his armies reached the Danube, and it was on the Sultan's Asiatic territories that the storm of war first fell, though the Russian force in that quarter was not of any formidable magnitude; and though the Caucasian frontier was too remote from Constantinople for even the most complete success which might be achieved

there to be expected greatly to shake the resolution of the Turkish Cabinet. In one respect, the war differed singularly from other wars, in the remarkable absence of any achievements on a great scale. No grand pitched battle was fought in either Europe or Asia, and the most important event in the whole campaign was the defence and capture of a single small town, of which the very name was previously unknown beyond its immediate neighbourhood.

The campaign in Asia began with all the dignity which could be imparted to it by the circumstance of being conducted by a Prince of the Imperial house. The Grand Duke Michael was Governor-General of the province of the Caucasus; and, in the very same week in which war was declared, he descended into the plains at the head of an army which, though not very numerous, was superior to that which the Turkish general, Mukhtar Pasha, could bring into the field, since many of Mukhtar's regiments had already been withdrawn from his command and transferred to Bulgaria, and those which were left him were scarcely sufficient to garrison the fortresses which the annals of the war of 1854 proved to be of great importance. His previous exploits afforded no great reason for placing confidence in the Pasha's military genius. In the preceding year, when commanding in Servia, he had been outgeneralled and defeated by Prince Nikita; but it was soon seen that he was fully equal to a contest with the Grand Duke. The Russian attack, as must have been foreseen, was first directed against the fortresses of Kars and Batoum. The glorious resistance which our own brave countryman, Sir Fenwick Williams, made at Kars in the Crimean war had given that fortress a reputation beyond its real strength, if, indeed, it may not be said that its apparent strength was a source of real weakness, since the garrison was scarcely sufficient to man the whole of the fortifications. The situation of Batoum on the coast rendered it, perhaps, even more important, and certainly in one point of view more defensible, inasmuch as Hobart Pasha's command of the sea enabled him at pleasure to introduce supplies, not only for the town itself, but for the entire district; and also to support it in case of attack, since his guns swept the approaches on either side. Till, therefore, the Russians in Europe crossed the Danube, it was on these fortresses and the district between them that the attention of military critics was concentrated; and there the operations of the two armies during May and June cannot be denied to have supported the prognostics of those who had contended that

nothing but a great superiority of numbers would give the Russians the victory. The Grand Duke did, indeed, succeed in capturing Ardahan, a fortress of considerable strength; but the general belief was that the arms to which it yielded were the golden ones employed by Philip rather than the steel in greater favour with his more heroic son, and the corruptibility of Turkish officials is unfortunately so fully established that it cannot be said that the imputation is incredible. But it was soon seen that Hobart Pasha's support was well able to secure the safety of Batoum. Kars, which, as yet at all events, no one could be found base enough to betray, maintained its old reputation for strength; and Mukhtar Pasha, who seemed to have profited by the severe lesson which he had received from the Servian Prince, gave many proofs, not only of stubborn courage, but of well-directed activity. It was a belief, at least as old as Sir Sidney Smith's repulse of Napoleon at Acre, that Turkish valour needed the support and shelter of fortifications; that, if invincible behind ramparts, the Turks lacked the mingled dash and coolness which make an army formidable in the open field. But Mukhtar seemed resolved to show that this opinion did them injustice. He was not content with merely maintaining fortresses which were attacked, but boldly took the field and became himself the assailant. It is impossible to rely with absolute certainty on the accounts given of the numbers of the respective armies, but there seems no question that the Russians had a considerable superiority; yet the Pasha gained decisive advantage over them in two separate combats (we adopt the word by which Napier distinguished actions on a small from those on a large scale, since neither the action at Delibaba nor that at Zerwin are entitled to be regarded as great battles). He recaptured the important frontier fortress of Bayazid, driving out the Russian garrison, which had recently made itself master of it. He compelled the Grand Duke to raise the siege of Kars, and gradually established so complete a superiority over the invaders on the Caucasian border that before midsummer he was able to turn the tables on them, and to send one of his lieutenants, Ismail Pasha, to cross the frontier and to become the invader of Russian territory. It is doing the Kurds no great injustice to regard them as 'the humble servants of events,' and as prepared to attach themselves to the side which seemed likely to prove the strongest; and the earnestness with which some of their chiefs now espoused the Sultan's side, and co-operated with bodies of the Circassians, who de-

scended on Soukum-kaleh, with the view of raising an insurrection against the Russian power in the Caucasus, may be taken as a proof of the confidence which these tribes now generally felt in the eventual triumph of the Turkish cause.

But the Russians were persevering; though their losses were probably much heavier than those of the Turks, they could better afford them; and before the end of the summer such strong reinforcements had been sent down to the Grand Duke that, by the first week in October, he was able to resume advance upon Kars with a force far greater than that with which he had formerly menaced it. Mukhtar Pasha was a brave man, indeed he was too brave. The campaign of 1855 had shown that Sir Fenwick Williams's system of operations was the best for the defence of that important position. He kept his troops within the fortress and the line of redoubts which covered it; and, in spite of his vast superiority in numbers, the Russian commander could make no progress till famine should come to his aid. But now Mukhtar resolved to meet his assailants in the open field, and, though he displayed brilliant gallantry, the result of the conflict which he invited proved the soundness of the English general's tactics.

On October 2 the two armies came in front of each other. Under the Grand Duke's orders were thirty-four battalions of infantry, ten regiments of cavalry, and twelve field batteries; while Mukhtar had scarcely more than half the Grand Duke's numbers. That under such circumstances he should have made the defence he did is an irresistible proof of the admirable quality of the Turkish soldier. Nor, if we were to grant that he was justified in fighting at all, could it be denied that he had himself shown no little judgment in the position which he had taken up. It occupied a short range of hills sloping gently to the north-west, and had been carefully entrenched; some earthworks, which had been hastily thrown up, being also armed with heavy siege guns of Krupp's best workmanship and of large calibre. The possession of these heights was the ostensible prize of the coming battle, but undoubtedly the Grand Duke reckoned that Kars itself was also staked upon the issue. Day had hardly dawned when one formidable column of twenty battalions, or nearly 25,000 men, if the regiments were of full strength (which, however, may be doubted), with fifty-six guns, advanced against the Turkish position on Yagni Tepe, the mortars covering their advance with an incessant stream of shells, which fell thickly among the Turkish entrench-

ments. The Grand Duke's object, as it seemed, was to force his way between the Turkish army and the great fortress. And throughout the entire day the Russians, in attacks of columns, made desperate efforts to gain a footing on the Yagni hills. Both armies displayed brilliant gallantry and resolution. Mukhtar was well seconded by more than one of his lieutenants. One in particular, Hussein Avni Pasha, brought up his division from Vezinkui, and barred the road with impenetrable steadiness. The Russian infantry had rarely exhibited more stubborn energy. Time after time, in spite of all the disadvantages of mounting a hill under fire, did they force their way up at least half of the steep slope ; but time after time were they driven down again by main strength, the Turks being manifestly the heavier and more powerful men, and adding to their ceaseless storm of musketry more than one charge with the bayonet. One Russian regiment with greater daring, or what for the moment seemed better fortune than their comrades, did succeed in reaching the conical summit of the hill ; but it was only to be driven down again with greater slaughter. The battle raged without intermission the whole day. The Turkish batteries were well served, and the carnage in the Russian ranks was fearful.

Even night was not allowed to bring its respite to the combatants. The Turks had been looking forward with anxious calculation to the sunset, since it was their festival of the Ramazan, and, while daylight was visible, they might not prepare their food. But, though the Grand Duke probably knew nothing of their religious motives for desiring a rest, he was eager to prevent them from strengthening the works which he had already found so formidable ; and, guided by a bright moon, his batteries played the greater part of the night with most effective precision on the line of entrenchments which crowned the Turkish heights.

At length the Russian gunners were exhausted, and for a brief space, scarcely exceeding two hours, the opposing armies gave themselves up to sleep. But with the first rays of the sun the Russian fire reopened with undiminished vigour. And again, under cover of the ceaseless cannonade, the Russian regiments pressed forward, like storming-parties at a breach, to force their way up the hill. Again the Turks resisted stoutly, but at last numbers prevailed. The Turks were gradually beaten back ; some regiments, even in defeat, maintained their discipline and order, but in others the retreat presently became a rout, and before midday six thousand Russians had made good their ground on the summit of the

well-contested Aladja Dag. Yet even now Mukhtar did not desist from his exertions. He collected those battalions which, though beaten, were yet unbroken; round them he rallied the fugitives, to whom his example restored courage and order; and, hopeless as the effort seemed, he led on charge after charge to drive the Russians from the hill they had won. It did not seem more hopeless than it was. The victorious Russians had captured their guns, and now turned them against their former masters, sweeping every path of approach. And at last, though not till the afternoon was far spent, the gallant Pasha drew off his men, and acknowledged his defeat by the cessation of all attempts to retrieve it.

In acknowledgment of his previous achievements the Sultan had conferred on him the title of Ghazi, or the Invincible. To this Mukhtar could no longer lay claim; but, if the name might mean Indomitable also, he showed that he had as good a right to it as ever. He fell back; and, recovering his beaten troops, after a day he took up a new position which still barred the way to Kars. But he had no means of obtaining any further reinforcement, while several fresh regiments crossed the Caucasus and joined the Grand Duke, who, in less than a fortnight after his former victory, was able once more to advance against him in irresistible strength. On the 15th General Lagureff with one division turned his position by a circuitous march, while the Grand Duke himself attacked it in front. Cut in two, as it were, the Turkish army was utterly routed; several thousand prisoners and the greater part of Mukhtar's guns were the trophies of the victory, and, what was worse, the enemy had succeeded in their object of interposing between him and Kars. And a few days afterwards they took Kars itself, under circumstances so suspicious that its fall, like that of Ardahan, has generally been attributed to the corruption and treachery of one of the Pashas to whom its defence was entrusted.

Yet the loss of even this bulwark of Armenia did not shake the intrepid spirit of the Ghazi. When he found himself cut off from Kars he had fallen back in front of Erzeroum, which, as the capital of the province, was even more important, though far less defensible. If he could defend that for a few weeks he might hope that the winter would before long come to his aid. He availed himself of the difficulties of that mountainous district with admirable skill, making a stand wherever the ground enabled him to do so, and more than once repulsing his pursuers, who pressed upon him, with considerable loss. Though, unfortunately for the



Turks, the winter, both in Armenia and Bulgaria, was far milder than usual, the snow did on more than one occasion seriously delay the Grand Duke's operations. And in spite of the crushing defeats which Mukhtar had sustained, and in spite of his inability to preserve Kars, he can hardly be denied to have closed the campaign with credit, since he covered Erzeroum to the last; and when, in January 1878, the armistice put an end to the war, Erzeroum was still untaken.

But no blows struck in Asia could be decisive of the contest. It was through Bulgaria alone that Constantinople could be approached; and it was in that province, therefore, that both the antagonists might be expected to make their principal efforts. Yet, strange to say, it was there that the commanders on both sides showed the most unaccountable want of skill and energy. Whether the Russians had really thought that the mere fact of their armies being put in motion would terrify the Turks into submission or not, they certainly had made no previous provision for either crossing the Danube or providing their army with the needful supplies while it remained in Roumania. Yet a host of 200,000 men, and it was no smaller number that was said to be collected round the standards, required long and careful preparation of appliances of all kinds. And the consequence was that, though they were aided beyond their expectations by the eagerness with which their alliance was now sought by the Prince of Roumania, who placed all his barracks, hospitals, and railways at their disposal, little dreaming of the mode in which they would eventually propose to recompense his friendly zeal, two months were suffered to elapse before the Russians reached the great river, and it was not till June 24 that their engineers began to put together their bridges of boats, and that the first regiments crossed the stream and established themselves on the enemy's soil.

Apathy and indolence, the combined results of their religious fatalism and of their deeply corrupting social system, are now so innate in the character of the Turks that the less surprise was caused by their inactivity; but military critics point out that the respite thus given them by the Russians, if turned to proper account by the Turkish generals, might have been so employed as to render the invasion impossible for the whole year. For, just as when the time came they made no attempt to hinder the passage of the Russians, so during May and the first half of June, when no opposition could possibly have been made to the passage of a Turkish

division to the left bank of the river, where it might easily have routed all the Roumanian forces in the district, and destroyed the Bucharest railway, by which alone the Russian stores could be conveyed to the south, they allowed the precious opportunity thus unexpectedly offered to them to slip by unimproved. They did nothing. They did not even take any vigorous steps to prevent or impede the construction of the bridges; and before the end of the first week of July at least 100,000 Russians had crossed the river, without meeting any obstacle worth speaking of, from Galatz and Ibraila. Even the gunboats, on which foreigners had generally reckoned for giving the Turks the mastery of the whole river, proved utterly inefficient. It has been surmised that the gallant and skilful Hobart Pasha was hampered by the jealousy of some of the Ministers under whose orders he was placed. What is certain is, that some of the gunboats were destroyed by the Roumanian batteries; that one at least was blown up by a torpedo; and that it was only by an act of daring, in which skill and hardihood were admirably combined, that the brave Englishman succeeded in making his way down the stream and reaching the open sea, where his arrival was anxiously expected by the fleet.

At first the Russians might almost have flattered themselves that they were marching to an assured and easy conquest. On the 27th they occupied Sistova without resistance, and began to push out detachments into the heart of the province. By the middle of July they had achieved a success which for a moment seemed to promise an early termination of the campaign. Nikopol, on the Danube, had a grand name, the City of Victory; and it was regarded by the Turks as well able to justify its title. But no fortress can be formidable where the government is supine and incapable. The governor, Hassan Pasha, was not deficient in courage; but his garrison was too weak for the extent of the works, and it was so unprovided with ammunition that he was almost utterly powerless to molest the division with which General Krudener proceeded to invest the place; so that by July 12 it was entirely surrounded on the landward side, while on the northern bank of the river the Roumanians erected batteries which commanded the side that faced the Danube. Apparently, when the Turks reckoned on the power of their different fortresses to retard the advance of the enemy, they forgot to take into their calculation the vast increase of range which since the Crimean war had been given to artillery. It was the opinion expressed by more than one British officer that even the

famous four, which made up the quadrilateral, would be found to be wholly defenceless against the new artillery of long range, unless they were surrounded with rings of fresh earth-works; and that such a degree of foresight could hardly be expected from the authorities which governed at Constantinople. Nor, indeed, could any such defences have kept back the Roumanian batteries from their own bank of the river. Under such circumstances it is creditable to the Turkish Pashas that they kept their assailants at bay for three days; but it was all that they could do. The Russians bombarded the town from the south and west. The Roumanians poured a ceaseless storm of shells across the Danube; and on the afternoon of the 16th Hassan could hold out no longer, but was compelled to surrender; 6,000 prisoners, forty guns, and large supplies of all kinds, except ammunition, becoming the prize of the conquerors.

The elation in the Russian camp was excessive. Other divisions, encouraged by this important success, pushed forward to the Balkans, regardless of the hindrances to their advance presented by the state of that part of Bulgaria, which is almost destitute of cross-roads, or side-roads, generally indispensable to the march of troops and the conveyance of supplies. In other respects, however, they found the condition of the country unexpectedly favourable. They, like the people of England, had been imbued with such accounts of the tyranny of the Turkish Government, and the consequent misery of the Turkish provinces, that they were wholly unprepared for the evidences of prosperity which met their eyes on all sides: well-planned, solid ranges of farm-buildings; rich crops of barley and maize; herds of fat, though small, cattle; and flocks of sheep which would have done no discredit to our own South Downs. Everything promised facilities for obtaining supplies, and the disposition of the inhabitants was hardly less in their favour. The comfort and security which the Bulgarians had evidently enjoyed under the rule of the Sultan had not entirely overcome their impatience of the Mussulman yoke; and the merciless cruelty with which the recent insurrection had been suppressed and chastised had diffused a general feeling of uneasiness and alarm, which had been carefully fostered by the Russian agents, who, indeed, had been the original stimulators of the insurrection. But the Bulgarians were hardly likely to estimate correctly the share which their invaders had had in producing the miseries which so many of them had suffered. They rather looked on them as present deliverers, and as such

received them with cordiality, showing great willingness, and even eagerness, to furnish quarters and provisions. Thus aided, the Russians pushed on with a rapidity which took the Turkish Pashas wholly by surprise. They crossed the Balkans at more than one point; and one of their most enterprising commanders, General Gourko, took Kezanlik, a town of some importance on the southern side of the great chain, burnt another, Zeni Sahgra, and established himself in such force in the Shipka Pass that there seemed little prospect of the Turks being able to prevent the Russians from marching on Adrianople, which was understood to be only half fortified and very insufficiently garrisoned. In fact the achievements of the last fortnight seemed so decisive that already the politicians of Vienna began to predict the conclusion of the war, and to discuss the conditions on which the Czar might be expected to consent to a peace.

But while affairs were in this state, indeed in the very same week in which General Gourko made this formidable progress, the genius of one Turkish commander suddenly raised an obstacle in the path of the victorious enemy which utterly baffled all these calculations. The Russians were in possession of the whole of the right bank of the Danube between Widdin and Rustchuk; and as a Turkish general, Osman Pasha, was moving eastward from Widdin on a line a few miles to the south of the Russian position, on arriving at Plevna, a town a few miles south of Nikopol and on the high-road from Rustchuk to Sophia, he was struck by the advantages of its position, which to his keen eye seemed to offer facilities for making a stand such as were furnished by perhaps no other place in the district. Plevna itself was a small, open town; but a river covered one side of it, and it was nearly surrounded at a small distance by a chain of hills of moderate height, which it would be easy to fortify. Osman was not like the generality of his countrymen. The moment that he had decided on his plan he proceeded to carry it into execution with a rapidity which would have been laudable in a man of any nation, but which in a Turk was absolutely marvellous. He drew lines of entrenchments, threw up earthworks, armed them with a few guns he found in the town and with his own field batteries; and in three days had gone a great way towards creating a fortress. The news reached General Krudener, who saw the importance of checking the progress of the works, but miscalculated his means of doing so. Apparently, he believed that Osman's force did not exceed two or three regiments, and, on the strength of this estimate,

he hastened to attack him with a force of 7,500 men. But, though he suspected it not, Osman had nearly three times that number. Nothing could have suited the Pasha better, as the repulse of an assault, when the works could not be supposed to be in any but a most imperfect state, would add threefold strength to them by the glory of the exploit. Krudener was utterly routed and forced to retreat with the loss of a third of his numbers; and Osman, greatly encouraged by the result of this first experiment of the value of his position, proceeded to strengthen his defences on every side, and to collect reinforcements for his garrison, till he had raised the latter to nearly 40,000 men, and had created such a mass of earthworks, redoubts, and batteries of all kinds as to be absolutely impregnable to all the exertions of the Russians, and to render the place safe from any enemy except famine.

From the day of General Krudener's repulse, the character of the war may be said to have been wholly changed, and the chief interest of the campaign centred in the little town which, though previously never dreamt of as a feature in the war, the genius of one man had suddenly turned into a first-class fortress. Operations did, indeed, continue in other quarters; but they were but little regarded in comparison. It must be added that they showed but little skill on either side. Even the imminent danger of their country had not been able to extinguish the jealousies which from time immemorial had distracted and weakened the councils of the Porte. It is impossible for outsiders to know with precision the truth of the statements which were continually bruited about; but it is certain that intrigues were as rife as ever in the palace; that Minister was being displaced by Minister; and that in the camp there was no concert between the generals, such as alone could lead to any desirable result. After more than one proof of incompetency, the commander-in-chief, Abdul Kerim, was recalled, and replaced by Mehemet Ali, a soldier of German extraction and training. But we may infer from the extreme caution of his movements, when energy would have found more than one opportunity of delivering an effective blow, that he could not rely on the co-operation of his subordinate officers; and one strong division was suffered to be gradually wasted away by Suleiman Pasha, who having, with shameful supineness, suffered General Gourko to fortify a position in the Shipka Pass, now seemed eager to repair his neglect by incessant attacks upon it, which, while they scarcely succeeded in causing the Russians

anything more than annoyance, cost him far more men than his country could afford to lose.

Nor for the ensuing two or three months could it be said that the Russians did much better. Ten days after Krudener's repulse before Plevna, the Grand Duke Michael himself attacked the new fortress in far greater strength. But Osman, whose men, under his vigilant energy, showed remarkable readiness in the construction of earthworks and batteries, had by this time rendered the place absolutely unassailable, and the Grand Duke was repulsed with heavy loss. In despair the Russians proceeded to turn the siege into a blockade; and to draw lines of circumvallation around Plevna, and to occupy posts on the different roads which led to it, lest Mehemet Ali should advance with his whole force to relieve it. But, as we have said, the new commander-in-chief was a man in whom caution predominated. His head-quarters were on the Lom, and in the course of August he defeated the Russian division opposed to him in several actions on a small scale; but he seems to have thought himself not strong enough to venture on a pitched battle, or to force his way to Plevna. His inactivity had its natural effect in encouraging the Russians, who now looked upon Osman as left to his fate, and resolved to make a greater effort than ever against him, hoping by his capture to be able to bring the campaign to a conclusion before winter should render further operations impracticable.

The new attack was made with unusual parade and pomp on September 11. So little did the Grand Duke anticipate failure that he invited the Czar himself to witness the result, and erected a lofty platform from which Alexander was to see the triumphs of his troops, and then to descend and enter the captured fortress as a conqueror. They were selling the bear's skin a little too soon. A strong Roumanian division had joined the Russians, and showed themselves quite equal in courage and discipline to their new comrades. But they only knew their own numbers, which they expected to prove irresistible; and had entirely failed to estimate the strength of the position they were advancing against. For a moment matters seemed to be going well for them. The Russian general Skobelev made himself master of three small redoubts, and the Roumanians forced their way into the great work known as the Gravitza redoubt. But both advantages proved equally delusive. Before mid-day on the 12th Skobelev was expelled from the redoubts which he had captured, while that of Gravitza was found to be so completely com-



manded by other batteries in its rear, which were totally unassailable, that it was rather a trap than a conquest ; and the Roumanians paid a bitter price in the loss of several hundred men for their brief possession of a post which it was equally dangerous to hold and to retreat from.

The Czar had gained this alone from his visit, that his own eyes had seen proof that a change of tactics was required if Plevna was to cease being an obstacle to the progress of his armies. And in his distress he remembered the skilful engineer who, more than twenty years before, had enabled Sebastopol to keep at bay for the greater part of a year the combined armies of England and France. General Todleben was sent to the front, and under his experienced guidance the siege of Plevna speedily assumed a new character. He could appreciate better than the Grand Duke the strength of the place, and the judgment with which the different outworks, batteries, and redoubts had been made to support each other. But he could also estimate more correctly the circumstances in his favour, the facilities which the character of the country around, the position of the towns on the southern and eastern sides, and even the scarcity of roads, afforded for cutting off all communication between the fortress and the Turkish armies in the field. And he saw that though a direct assault could hardly succeed, a well-organised blockade could hardly fail. '*Place assise est place prise*,' is, perhaps, the oldest military proverb ; and from the day that the arrangements were entrusted to Todleben, there was a general feeling that it was to receive a fresh exemplification. Plevna, as it was commonly said, would prove to be another Metz ; and, indeed, there were solid reasons for anticipating that it was a place which must soon yield to a strong and vigilant blockade : for, as we have seen, it was not a large city, which even in time of peace contained large supplies, but a small rural town which, till it thus sprang into military importance, had never felt the necessity, nor probably, had the means of accumulating stores of any kind. What could be done Osman did ; for a few weeks he made gallant sallies to meet convoys which came up to him from Sofia and Orchanie ; but, stimulated by Todleben, the Russian and Roumanian generals gradually blocked up the approaches from these places. Early in November Gourko succeeded in placing a strong force upon the Sofia Road ; and from that time no more convoys reached the beleaguered garrison. As the month advanced he drew the circle closer, taking Dubnik, Etropol, and other forts which might in some degree be re-

garded as outposts of the great fortress ; while Mehemet Ali, who had been exerting himself in vain to collect a force sufficient to enable him to give Gourko battle, felt himself at last compelled to renounce the attempt as hopeless. We need not dwell upon operations in other parts of the province, at Tirnova or Teliche ; if Plevna could only hold out, any other successes which the Russians might achieve were useless ; if Plevna fell, it may be almost said they would be superfluous. But it was clearly now only a question of time. It was suspected, by the beginning of December it was ascertained, that the garrison was starving. At last, on December 10, Osman decided that to hold Plevna longer could only lead to the destruction or captivity of his gallant garrison ; and he resolved on a sally of the whole force, with the object of cutting his way through the besieging host, and joining Mehemet Ali. His plan was well conceived, but it is believed that it had been betrayed to the Roumanian commander by a deserter. It is certain that he found the besiegers prepared at all points to encounter him. A desperate conflict ensued ; he himself fell severely wounded ; and finally, after all the endeavours of his men to break through the hostile lines had been repulsed, and they fell back on the town, they found that, while they were fighting with one division of the besiegers in front, other detachments had passed behind them, and occupied the works from which they had sallied forth ; that their retreat was cut off, and that nothing remained but unconditional surrender. The number of prisoners proved smaller than had been expected ; Osman had not 30,000 men left ; and those so weakened by famine and disease that it was wonderful how they had held out so long ; even those who were most unfriendly to the Turks could not refuse the tribute of admiration and sympathy to their gallantry ; and the Czar did honour to himself when he left Osman his sword as the best reward for his unavailing heroism.

There were still combats to be fought, and places to be taken, but in effect, every one regarded the fall of Plevna as decisive of the war. The Government of the Porte did, indeed, for a while maintain a bold face, and in the speech with which, three days afterwards, the Sultan opened the Turkish Parliament, after alluding in well-turned terms of praise to the zeal with which numbers 'of his Christian subjects had responded to his appeal for their participation in the defence of the country,' he proceeded to speak of the measures of internal reform which he was prepared to adopt, as if nothing which had happened had any tendency to weaken his

authority. But this assumption of a confident air could deceive no one. If the Turkish Government pretended blindness to the consequences of the fall of Plevna, the Russians showed themselves fully alive to its importance. The Grand Duke instantly sent reinforcements to General Gourko to enable him to master the district between the Balkans and Constantinople. Soon the Turkish division which was still struggling with desperate tenacity in the Shipka Pass was surrounded. The weather was bad ; the snow was deep ; but with prodigious energy, such as the certainty of coming triumph can best engender, the Russians dragged artillery and ammunition up mountain paths, which even in summer cannot be ascended without toil and danger. And the first week of the new year saw them masters of the Shipka Pass also, with the whole of Suleiman's division for their prisoners. Now at last, the boldest of the Turkish generals and ministers saw that all hope of further resistance was gone. The Sultan implored the intervention of our Queen and other Sovereigns to procure peace, and himself solicited an armistice to give time for such negotiations as he hoped might terminate the struggle which his request itself confessed his inability to maintain. We need not dwell on the discussions which preceded the granting of the request, and during which the Russians steadily advanced towards Constantinople itself, till they came within sight of the city ; nor on the subsequent and more important negotiations in which the Russians laid down the conditions on which alone they would grant peace, with the air of absolute conquerors, which indeed they were ; but with respect to which they observed a silence so mysterious and strange as to give rise to the most sinister rumours respecting their designs, and to create a very general suspicion that they aimed at the seizure, or, at least, at the temporary occupation of Constantinople itself. To what extent, or whether at all the advance of the British fleet to the mouth of the Bosphorus, and the imposing display of our strength, though only for the purpose of affording protection in case of emergency to the British inhabitants of Constantinople, produced any modification of the terms originally proposed by the Russian plenipotentiaries, we shall probably never know. It is certain that when, on March 2, the treaty was signed, some of its articles seemed at first sight less severe than common rumour had reported them, though the comparative moderation with which they were for a moment credited, disappeared before a more rigorous scrutiny. The acceptance of the seals of the Foreign office by the

Marquis of Salisbury imposed upon him the obligation of setting before the different Governments of Europe the view of the treaty taken by Her Majesty's Ministers; and, accordingly, at the beginning of the present month, he embodied them in a despatch equally distinguished for the judicial calmness of its tone and for the penetrating logic with which it laid bare the effect of the different stipulations on the position of Turkey and Russia themselves, on the one hand, and, on the other, on that of the rest of the nations of Europe, to whom the condition of the Ottoman Empire is a matter of common interest. With respect to Turkey, he showed that the terms imposed on her were such as not only at once almost to extinguish her political independence, but also that they are ingeniously framed so as to provide a plea for further coercion in the event of contingencies, which, to say the least, can not be deemed improbable; while, as to Russia, she is to gain even more than Turkey loses. The acquisition of Besarabia and Batoum will render her dominant in the Black Sea and the districts bordering on it; while that of the fortresses in Kurdistan will place at the mercy of her narrow commercial system the extensive European trade with Persia, which now passes through Trebizonde.

Nor will her aggrandisement be confined to the acquisition of the fortresses, ports, and districts actually ceded to her. The province of new Bulgaria will indeed be nominally free, but practically will only exchange one master for another. It will rest with Russia to choose its ruler, to frame its administration, and even to control the first working of its institutions. While that considerable portion of its population which is Greek in race and sympathy, will be placed in a condition far worse, as one of more constant and permanent degradation, than even when it was exposed to the worst excesses of Turkish caprice. Nor are our own national interests entirely unaffected by some of the stipulations. It cannot, as Lord Salisbury expresses it, be otherwise than a matter of extreme solicitude to this country that the Government, which has the Power to close or to open the Straits which form the natural highway of nations between the Ægean Sea and the Euxine, should be so closely pressed by the political outposts of a greatly superior Power, that its independent action and even existence is almost impossible. Though any objection which, on this ground, we might advance to the treaty, would probably be based, not on any special and peculiar injury to ourselves, but on the general rights of all nations.

On the moral character of the demand for Bessarabia, Lord Salisbury forbears to touch; though perhaps the whole treaty does not contain one more thoroughly characteristic of the inveterate appetite for territorial acquisition, which, ever since the days of Peter the Great, has marked the Russian Government. The manner in which the Czar had fulfilled similar professions at Khiva may prevent our feeling any great surprise at his demand of Ardahan, Kars, and Batoum, being the commentary on his original denial of a single project of self-aggrandisement. But the most absolute disbeliever in his moderation could hardly have been prepared for his claim of Bessarabia, and for the novel ingenuity displayed in the reward of a zealous and most indispensable ally by stripping him of an important and highly valued province. In the old fable which spoke of a giant and a dwarf carrying on a joint warfare against a common enemy, we do indeed read that most of the glory was reaped by the giant, and that most of the wounds fell to the share of the dwarf: but the ancient fabulist never conceived the idea of representing the dwarf's severest mutilations as inflicted by the giant himself. The invention of such a recompence for a friend was reserved for modern history, and a champion of humanity.

At the very commencement of the negotiations between the belligerents, it had been suggested by the Austrian Chancellor that, as all the principal Governments of Europe were parties to the Treaty of 1856, and were equally interested in seeing that the treaty now to be concluded should contain the elements of lasting stability and tranquillity, a Congress of the different nations should be assembled, which should examine the stipulations to be embodied in it in friendly discussion, and in a spirit of amicable compromise, and should, it might be hoped, eventually by their formal sanction confer on it a character of solidity and permanence. The proposal met with general concurrence; but, as the negotiations proceeded, the Russian Prime Minister advanced a pretension to make a distinction between the different articles of the Treaty, so as to separate those which, as he affirmed, concerned the late belligerents alone, from those in which the nations of Western Europe also were interested, indicating a resolution to submit the latter portion alone to the consideration of the Congress. And the principal object of Lord Salisbury's despatch is to show the absolute necessity, if the Congress is to meet at all, that every article of the treaty shall be within its competence to examine. To quote

his own words : ' Every material stipulation which it contains involves a departure from the Treaty of 1856.' And from such a premiss it is an irresistible conclusion that every Power, which was a party to that treaty, must be consulted before it is set aside in a single article.

For a moment it was believed that the wide divergence of opinion between the Governments of Her Majesty and of the Czar would be fatal to the proposed Congress. But as this belief, or, shall we say, apprehension, keeps varying in strength from day to day, we cannot yet pronounce it absolutely certain that the Congress will take place, though individually we may think that it will. But a second opinion was also started, that the only alternative to a Congress was war ; and that, if we did not meet Europe at Baden or Berlin, we must inevitably prepare to meet Russia on the field of battle. Doubtless there are grounds for such an apprehension, but there are even more for our hope that, Congress or no Congress, our Government will be able to preserve for us the blessings of peace. Undoubtedly, if Russia should refuse to meet us in Congress on terms of which every other State in Europe recognises the propriety, she may protract the general feeling of uneasiness and disquietude ; but it does not follow from that that she will draw us into war. The fixed resolution of our Ministry to maintain peace at every price save that of honour, was avowed in the message in which Her Majesty lately announced to her Parliament her intention of calling out her reserve forces,—she had come to that resolution ' for the maintenance of peace.' And, so far as we can say, there is no fear that the determination announced with dignity, will not be adhered to with firmness ; while there is, if possible, still less probability that Russia will wantonly, and for the mere gratification of diplomatic obstinacy, seek to engage in a fresh war, and with such an antagonist. Among the doubtful questions on which Europe in general expected the late war to throw light, and for the solution of which a party among ourselves was especially anxious, as believing it might affect the tranquillity of our Indian Empire, one of paramount importance was what were the conclusions to be drawn from it respecting the military strength of Russia, and how far her recent success against Turkey is to be regarded as an additional danger to British India. In neither point of view, neither as to the general strength of Russia, nor as to any possible danger from her to ourselves, have we ever been among the alarmists ; and if we were not so before, the recent campaign, as we view it, is certainly not calculated to engender any



increased uneasiness. On the contrary, it seems conclusively to prove that, though the rigour of her climate makes her very strong for self-defence, as an aggressive power she cannot be considered by any means in the first rank. Certainly it is nearly two centuries since Turkey has been considered a Power of the first class. In recent years her generals have not been credited with any high degree of professional skill; and, moreover, in the present instance she was far from presenting a solid united front of resistance to the invader. Disaffection to her rule had been widely spread in the province which in Europe was the seat of war; and, as we have seen, a large section of the Bulgarians was certainly inclined to greet the Russians as deliverers. Yet, though Russia was not relying solely on her own strength, but had secured the valuable alliance of Roumania, and though the attitude of Servia also caused no unimportant diversion in her favour, yet for the first six months of the campaign the balance of success was generally in favour of the Turks; and the victory which really decided the war was achieved by Roumanian arms. In Europe, then, we have nothing to fear from her. Nor in Asia can we think that her acquisition of a port in the Black Sea, and of two fortresses between the Caucasus and the Armenian frontier, can effectually facilitate any designs against British India, if she is insane enough to cherish such. She is far nearer India at Khiva than at Kars; but, restless as the Afghans still may be, those who know them best have the least fears of their joining any other Christian power against us. Their chiefs are too good judges which nation has the greatest resources; and the experience which previously subdued countries have had of Russian rule is not such as to tempt others to invite it. While to imagine that Russia would ever send a hostile force along the Euphrates to embark in the Persian Gulf is to suppose that a nation with scarcely a dozen men-of-war would select as the field for a struggle that on which above all others Britain is admitted to be invincible.

As we have said before, we cannot as yet venture positively to predict the abandonment by Russia of her objections to the Congress, though we have a strong conviction that she will ultimately yield to the general voice of Europe, which, with a rare approach to unanimity, has pronounced in favour of Lord Salisbury's arguments; and, still more, to her perception of her own interest, which is deeply concerned that the Treaty of San Stefano, into whatever form it may

VOL. VI.—NO. XI.

Q

eventually be moulded, should be guaranteed by the general sanction of the other Great Powers. Still less will we presume to anticipate the character and extent of the modifications which may be suggested, pressed, and decided on. On those points, if the Congress should meet, we shall wait for its proceedings with great anxiety, but it will be the anxiety of curiosity rather than the solicitude of fear. On one point we have no doubt,—what will be the attitude taken up, and the language held by our ambassador. They will exhibit a singular independence; they will be those of a mediator, not of a litigant. We shall have no selfish objects to promote: nothing to gain, and but little to fear. Save the one question of the free navigation of the Straits for vessels of commerce we have no immediate interest at stake, and in that all the world's interest is the same. And it is absolutely impossible that any topic which can be discussed can affect our national honour. It will be for the interests and honour of others, and among them, of both the late belligerents, that we shall be vigilant. And in the consideration of those objects, whenever any topics are brought forward on which it is due to ourselves to make our voice heard, it will be heard with effect. Our attitude during the past year, however at one time misunderstood, must now be admitted to have been that of conscious strength. We felt that we could afford to be quiet because we are well prepared to encounter all changes or emergencies. But the moment that the successes of the conqueror, which he was seen to have achieved, and the further designs which he was suspected of meditating, suggested the barest possibility of any affront to our national dignity, or any injury or peril to our fellow-countrymen, we made an instant display of our power and resolution, before which all the danger, if any had really existed, instantly vanished. There has rarely been a more imposing exhibition on a small scale than the passage of our fleet up the narrow and intricate passage of the Dardanelles, through a storm of wind and snow which would have made the navigation of the most familiar waters uncertain and difficult; and the general approval with which that display of our power and determination was received at home, with the cordial support given to our Government by the Parliament, and the resolution to support it in steps even more vigorous if the necessity should unhappily arise, will not be forgotten in the coming Congress. It will give our voice greater effect than ever; and that it does so there is no nation but will have cause to rejoice, since that voice will be steadily lifted up in favour of

peace. To preserve peace is always the first duty of the government of every nation. To preserve it while other countries are at war, and by preserving it oneself to lead to its re-establishment between others, is its greatest, because its purest, glory.

### SHORT NOTICES.

*Reply to the Short Notice in the 'Church Quarterly Review' of January 1878, of an Enquiry whether the Success of the Evangelical Movement of the Eighteenth Century consisted chiefly in the Propagation of Dissent.* By the Bishop of LLANDAFF. (London : Rivingtons, 1878.)

AFTER a careful perusal of the Bishop of Llandaff's remarks upon our 'Notice,' we cannot but think that his chief objection to it is founded upon a misapprehension of his own, for which we cannot hold ourselves responsible. It seems to us that he has misunderstood a passage which he quotes not quite accurately from page 318 of our last number, that *the success of the Evangelical movement consisted chiefly in propagating Dissent*. To this he refers again and again, and appears to gather from our use of the word *success* or *succeeded*, (1) that we regarded the propagation of Dissent as the object for which the Evangelical Fathers worked, and (2) that this result, when brought about, was to them, in our view, a cause of self-glorification.

Now what we really said was, that while *working for the revival of true religion*, they *succeeded* chiefly in propagating Dissent, and we intended to contrast the object of their work with what we hold to have been its result. They succeeded, doubtless, to some extent in what they aimed at, but chiefly in something at which they did not aim. We are really sorry to have to trespass on our readers' patience in making this explanation, but the Bishop's evident misunderstanding of it renders it necessary. Dean Mansel makes a somewhat similar use of the word *succeeded* when he says<sup>1</sup>—

'Boethius wrote his *Commentaries* with the design of reconciling Aristotle and Plato—he *succeeded* only in contradicting himself.'

We should be surprised if the Bishop of Llandaff, or any one else, were to suppose from this that self-contradiction formed any part of Boethius' design, or that when attained it was a matter of satisfaction.

The Bishop then proceeds to qualify the first two (only) of those admissions which we noted in his former pamphlet : his chief remark being that if certain acts of Venn and others tended towards schism, this does not prove that the chief success of Evangelicalism was to propagate Dissent.

<sup>1</sup> *Artis Logicae Rudimenta*. Aldrich. Edited by H. L. Mansel, B.D. Page 162, 3rd edition, 1856.

We are quite aware of it. But if the Bishop admits, *first*, that the course adopted did encourage Dissent, and, *secondly*, that during the Evangelical ascendancy, Dissent flourished, surely he has, as our Short Notice said, conceded nearly all that the Article contended for. We gave many proofs. We could have given many more.

The Bishop mentions Walker of Truro—a case in which, if in any, we might have looked for better things, as his classes were more carefully ordered than was common; yet no sooner was he dead than ‘a goodly number’ of his followers fell away, founding a chapel in Truro, and giving an impetus to Dissent in S. Columb and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> So lately as 1815, we gather from the *Life of Mr. Thorne*,<sup>2</sup> that a Mr. Evans, a strong Calvinist, curate of Shebbear, North Devon, who worked diligently in his parish, removed the handsome rood-screen from his church ‘as a protest against symbolical, as distinguished from real worship,’ and finding few clergy like-minded, called in the co-operation of Cradock Glascott, Lady Huntingdon’s itinerant at Hatherleigh. Their combined exertions resulted in Mrs. Thorne’s experiencing conversion. She sought Methodist companionship, and fell in with Mr. O’Bryan, an ex-Wesleyan, who was roaming about the country preaching on his own account. She gave her two sons to the Gospel, and officiated frequently herself. Mr. J. Thorne, an earnest and energetic man, may be regarded as the organizer of the sect now known as the Bible Christians, numbering some 21,000.

In April 1802, Wilberforce’s correspondent<sup>3</sup> writes that in the large parish of Helmsley ‘there are seldom twenty people at Church:’—

‘Such is the declension among Dr. Conyers’ old hearers, that there is not above one house in the town where family prayer is kept up. The fallen state of the town ought to warn congregations in the Established Church who are deprived of Evangelical pastors against the evil of Dissent. The Helmsley people, impatient with Dr. Conyers’ successor, built a Dissenting meeting-house, and crowded it in shoals. After many vicissitudes of preachers and preaching, it is shut up, and the people go nowhere, contenting themselves with railing at formal ministers and blind guides.’

What do these results show?

On page 16 his lordship seems to mistake our drift. Our question was, not whether men should be passive in an age of coldness, but whether as Churchmen they ought not to have kept within Church lines. The Bishop assumes that the Evangelicals alone taught the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, or, at any rate, with few exceptions; but his own quotations show that others were up and doing. And we believe, to use the words of Stubbs, that—

<sup>1</sup> *Lady Huntingdon’s Life*, vol. ii. pp. 415, 418.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoir of James Thorne of Shebbear*. Bible Christian Book Room, London, 1873.

<sup>3</sup> *Wilberforce Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 243.

<sup>4</sup> It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all who, in what was called the High Church school of Anglicanism, deserved well of their own generation, and handed on the light to the next. The names of Bishops Butler, Wilson, Conybeare, Wake, Potter, Gibson, Berkeley, Lowth, are instances in point. Bingham, who died in 1723, and Waterland, who died in 1740, were men whose works are not likely to be superseded in ecclesiastical or doctrinal history. Dr. Johnson may perhaps be taken as a representative layman.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Side by side with these were the rising Evangelical party. The views of this school are marked by a tendency to an exclusive subjectiveness in doctrine, and to a low estimate of the sacraments, as well as of the safeguards sought by the Church in discipline and liturgical ordinances. The doctrine of justification by faith alone was exalted by them into a position which it had never held authoritatively in the English Church.<sup>2</sup> And the atonement of our Lord was used rather as the watchword of a limited school than as the foundation of common Christianity. While there was no reason to suppose that these doctrines were held less firmly by the great body of Churchmen than by themselves, they alienated the sympathies of most moderate men by a sort of claim to be the sole depositaries of the truth. The result was a certain narrowness of mind and corresponding shallowness of theology.<sup>3</sup>

We cannot but think the Bishop is unreasonable in considering that we prove nothing unless we prove that *all* the serious clergy approved the proceedings of their fellows. We know that there were exceptions; but surely it is out of the mouths of those who *were* the exceptions that we learn most conclusively both the nature and the extent of the evil.

Again we are truly sorry that our reading of the facts compels us to a different conclusion from that of Mr. Maclagan, on whom the bishop relies so strongly. And regarding the 157 registered sects, we cannot think we owe a debt, which can never be repaid, to those who were chiefly instrumental in calling them into being. But this only enhances our pleasure when we can agree with him. We assent heartily to his condemnation of the deadness of our services in times past, as also of 'the old superstition not yet exploded, which South quaintly describes as a belief that we could be pulled up to heaven by our ears.' We are quite at one with him in thinking that present circumstances demand irregular efforts, but 'in perfect loyalty to the Church system,' and also in his belief 'that few things

<sup>1</sup> Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* ed. Stubbs, 1863. Vol. iii. p. 603.

<sup>2</sup> Or, we may add, in the Church Catholic. On this let us quote Sir J. Stephen's *Evangelical Succession*, ed. of 1875, p. 439, where, after enumerating Tertullian, Cyprian, Basil, and the chief of the Fathers, he says:—

'Whatever may be the truth or whatever the antiquity of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, Milner has not been able to prove that it held in the theological system of those Fathers of the Church the all-important work assigned to it by the great Reformer, Luther. That this polar star of our faith underwent a protracted and almost a total eclipse, is one of those strange and obstinate facts which the inquiries of Milner ascertained, and which his integrity has virtually acknowledged.'

<sup>3</sup> Stubbs' *Mosheim*. Ed. 1863. Vol. iii. p. 604.

would help more to attach the people to the Church than a full and faithful adherence to the Church's system;' and, lastly, that 'had there been zeal enough in the Church to provide the means of grace and ministrations of the Church for our growing population, they would not have been driven to the formation of those habits of neglect [of religious worship], the uprooting of which is proverbially so difficult;' for Mr. Maclagan believes that not the Church only, but religion generally, has lost its hold on the masses.<sup>1</sup>

And this last quotation leads us on to the question which the Bishop asks repeatedly—why did not the Church party make greater exertions? Practically, this question was answered in the original article, which dwelt largely on the causes which led to the suppression of those exertions which it was making, and making with such marked success up to the time of Walpole's administration. We cannot repeat the details, but it should be added that, until after the death of the Pretender, in 1788, for a clergyman to be known as an energetic Churchman was to incur the suspicion of the Government, and probably persecution as a Jacobite. The door of preferment was absolutely closed to such men, so that they were only too thankful to be allowed to work quietly in their own parishes.<sup>2</sup> No influence of theirs would have induced the Government to repeal the acts which restricted Church-building, or the free action of the Church, and the obstinate refusal to sanction a Colonial Episcopate is a case in point. The men above named by Stubbs were not preferred because of their churchmanship, but because they were Whigs, and therefore expected to prove latitudinarians. Wake and Gibson had greatly aided the Government by their pens. Berkeley's Philosophy led to his promotion, and perhaps also some pity for a man whom the Government had caused to sacrifice his time, his money, and his library. Secker had been a Presbyterian preacher, Butler a Dis-

<sup>1</sup> See Essay X. in *The Church and the People* (1870), by W. D. Maclagan, M.A.

<sup>2</sup> For a singularly apposite description of the working of persistent discouragement, we cannot help quoting the following words of Bishop Wilberforce:—'The sight of such perpetual wrongs, endured by such as will endure them, produces a marvellous effect on the more generous-hearted of the young, who ought to furnish the next generation of clergy, and their early aspirations are weaned from the ministry of such a Church. When the highest abilities, the soundest learning and the heartiest loyalty are thus resolutely ostracised, there is first an enfeebling of the strength which should have been supplied by the resources withheld. The effect is the same as in the natural body, loss of tone, a general tendency to listlessness and apathy. Nor is this all. On the men marked out for such unmerited exclusion, even on the most high-minded and patient, it works for evil. There is no legitimate room for exertion of talents, which, when not spent for the blessing of others, feed inwardly on the heart, nor is it possible to love, as they should have loved it, the community of which they are scarcely admitted to be loyal citizens. They may pray for the peace of Jerusalem, but it cannot be to them the Zion in which they have delighted with all the intensity of Christian ardour. It is a *dura noverca*, not a loving mother, for whom they are called on to labour.'—'The Church and her Bishops,' *Quarterly Review*, October 1863, p. 542.



sender, known to Clarke. Of Horne, Jones remarks that he was preferred in spite of his merits, and then only when so feeble that he could scarce climb the steps of his palace. Wilson was a Churchman, but he owed his promotion, as did Hildesley, to the Earl of Derby. It was the responsibility of their office, and the Church system itself, which disciplined most of these men into becoming what they were; and if Wilson and Hildesley met all the growing needs of the growing population of Man, is it unreasonable to suppose that their English brethren would have done the like had their hands been free? Had the Evangelical Fathers worked in Church lines, strengthened instead of weakening the Bishops, can we doubt the result would have been different? When the Church party *did* begin to move, we must all admit that it did it to good effect, and that the hand of the spoiler has been stayed.

As to the question of morals, if the Bishop is not satisfied with the census paper, and the official return of applications for divorce, and the admissions of Evangelical writers, we must give up the hope of convincing him. But when he goes on to hold himself excused from defending the Church character of the Societies founded by the Evangelicals, we must be allowed to differ. The Church Missionary Society calls itself a Church society, and if this society represents the *churchmanship* of its founders, what must their laxity have been? Let our readers refer to the short pamphlet lately issued by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, entitled, 'Diocesan Organisation in India,' and contrast its spirit with that exhibited by the Church Missionary Society, as shown in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, pp. 48-51, for the year 1871.

As to the Bible Society, however much we may differ from it, we should be grieved indeed to misrepresent its actions. We asserted that Mr. Charles was an ex-clergyman and an itinerant preacher among the Calvinistic Methodists, that the version of Scripture issued under his superintendence was cancelled, and that in 1827 the Bible Society had no Welsh Bible. So far, we believe, the Bishop allows us to be correct. We abstained from specifying the nature of the errors which Charles had committed, not having examined the subject carefully. We feel, therefore, that we are in no way deserving of censure for the mere statement of a fact. The Bishop evidently has been reading the article in the *Quarterly Review* of July, 1827,<sup>1</sup> and this portion of his pamphlet is rather an answer to the charges made in that periodical than by us. The writer in the *Quarterly* does imply that the sense of Scripture was tampered with. The Bishop admits that a charge of 'altering the translation' was made, as also complaint 'that unwarrantable liberties were being taken.' But his lordship affirms the charge to be untrue. The cause of the withdrawal of this edition from circulation was, according to the Bishop, that Charles's spelling was incorrect. That the Bishop has quite convinced himself of the truth of his assertion we readily

<sup>1</sup> 'The Management of the British and Foreign Bible Society.'—*Quarterly Review*, June, 1827.

credit. But, seeing that Charles is declared to be an able Welsh scholar, that he published in 1805 a Scripture dictionary, which in 1836 reached a third edition, we confess it taxes our credulity to the utmost to believe that with such a famine of the Word of God as then existed, an edition of the Scriptures was cancelled for the sole reason that certain words were misspelt which in a second edition could be remedied.

The Bishop, writing hastily, is in error in quoting the Reviewer as saying 'the Bible Society was so ordered as in an irreligious era to exclude the doctrines of the Church.' This was said of the British and Foreign School Society, quite a different thing. The Reviewer did represent the Bible Society as encouraging greater freedom of thought, and the Bishop objects to this phrase, though he can hardly deny that a Society so constituted must promote rationalism, and rationalism too often leads to infidelity. Our original article cited the case of a late Bishop of Salisbury, who withdrew from it because he found it impossible for a meeting of persons assembled to promote the circulation of God's Word, joining in worshipping Him in prayer; and the Rev. W. Phelan, in a tract, 'The Bible, not the Bible Society,' quotes the Rev. J. Owen as stating that it was the principle of the Society to admit Jews and Mohammedans. We cannot, therefore, deem our phrase inapplicable.

One word only in conclusion, and that in reference to the Bishop's strictures on the spirit and motive of our article of last October. The Bishop misconceives us totally if he imagines that one thought of bitterness, or one idea of detraction from the personal goodness or good intentions of those whose course we criticised, had entered our minds. It was the measures, not the men, the results, not the intentions, on which we remarked. We should have thought also that a *bishop* could scarce have failed to appreciate the obvious motive which underlay so much of what he criticises, namely, to enforce by an actual example the danger of attempting a reform by means which involve defective principles. All history shows that in such cases the reform is doubtful, that the ultimate Nemesis of the defective principle is sure. Even when at first the reform seems likely to succeed, its fruit is but frail and temporary, it fades and withers, and leaving only the resulting mischief in stubborn permanence. It was so with the mendicant orders which came to the rescue of the Latin Church, and which that Church is so often (mistakenly) lauded for its cleverness in turning to account. For the moment, indeed, they were of signal service, but their *principles* carried within them the seeds of future mischief, which a truer foresight—or what would have answered the same purpose, a more tenacious conscience—would have avoided. Can any one doubt that the ultimate evils of the mendicant orders far, far outweighed their immediate services? The lesson is not less wanted now, and that in more than one department of the spiritual and moral work of the Church of England. Happily, it is an age of zeal, but all the more need that those whose business is either to rule or to guide, should seek by every means in their power to instruct that zeal in the

principles of that religion and that Church, whose shortcomings they seek to supply.

*Studia Sacra.* Commentaries on the Introductory Verses of S. John's Gospel, and on a Portion of S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; with other Theological Papers. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co.)

If Churchmen welcome Mr. Keble's sermons, they will be specially glad to receive this fragment of a commentary, however brief, from his pen. It consists of a commentary on the *first fifteen* verses of the Gospel of S. John, of an admirable exposition of chapters i. to vi. of the Epistle to the Romans, and a useful analysis of S. Paul's Epistles. Besides this, we have a valuable *excursus* on the question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, in which, without adding much of his own, Mr. Keble has arranged in a systematic manner (1), the Scriptural evidence; and (2), *references* to the Patristic evidence bearing on the question, so far as relates to S. Augustine for the Latins, S. Athanasius, S. Cyril Alex, and S. Basil, for the Greeks. These latter his editor, Canon Norris, has transcribed at length and *translated*, so as to constitute the *excursus* and appendix together a useful handbook (to the extent of its purpose) of the controversy. Some 'Notes on the Greek Testament,' found in an interleaved Cambridge Testament, which was much used by Mr. Keble in his earlier years, have been added as an appendix. They extend over the first eleven chapters of S. Matthew's Gospel, and are avowedly meant to serve as a *specimen*. This *quasi* Commentary is, of course, pious, and occasionally suggestive, but does not, on the whole, seem to possess any specially marked character, and we think the editors have been well advised in not printing it *in toto*, as was originally projected. It is the more incumbent on us to say this, because they are early works being published posthumously. Unquestionably Mr. Keble's writings, early or late, would have considerable value for all readers; but the early work of not one man in a thousand would stand such a test; and besides, as the editors allow in their preface—

'Some who read this preface may think that whatever reasons lead us to withhold a portion should prevail against the publication of any of these posthumous papers, for none appear with his sanction.

'It is true, we have not his leave. It may be true that some portions of what is here given are quite unequal to his later writings. It is probable that, had he been asked to publish them before he left us, he would have declined'—(p. xiii.).

So we are glad that they have decided as they have. In the fragment of a commentary on S. John we have the fruit of his riper years, and are face to face with a very different kind of work. Probably there have been very few men the character of whose minds fitted them, as was the case with Mr. Keble, to enter into relation and *rapprochement* with the mind of the greatest of the Evangelists. In him the spiritual Gospel has found a spiritually-minded commentator of the rarest excellence, and the perusal of this fragment gives (to use the words

of Dr. Pusey) 'a thought what the golden string might have been could he have brought himself to undertake it earlier.'

It will not be expected of us, therefore, that we should do anything in the way of criticism upon this voice from the grave of one in whom the whole Anglican Communion revered a saint. The very character of the commentary, which is exactly like that of the sermons, and singularly different from the critical character of modern writings, indisposes the reader from taking this course. But we will give a short extract :—

"*In Him*," in that which He vouchsafed to become at His Incarnation—was Life; the Life of all creatures that have ever lived was due, in God's secret and eternal counsels, to that condescension of the Word. *And the Life was the Light of men*; of all men especially, that Life was, is, and ever will be, the Light. The "Breath of Life breathed" into Adam's "nostrils," whereby he "became a living soul," caused him to be in the image of God, who "is Light," and in whom "is no darkness at all." "God saw all that He had made" in Adam, "and behold, it was very good." The Life that He had given him was Light, heavenly Light. The two at the beginning were blended into one, so entirely were man's physical and intellectual powers pervaded and imbued with "righteousness and true holiness." It was "the Life of God in the soul of man;" and true Light, except so imparted, man never had nor could have any. What may seem to be such—call it wisdom, knowledge, understanding, invention, counsel, energy, largeness of heart, or by what name soever it may be known—is all a mere dream or worse, except so far as it comes from the Word which was in the beginning with God. For as the secret presence of that Word, and His communication of Himself has been the principle of *Life* to all that have lived, so, whatever real *Light* the children of men have at any time enjoyed, or in any measure, it has been only due to this same Divine Presence; a spark, as it were, of the vital fire mysteriously abiding within them, struck out by His providential working according to the counsel of His own will. The *Light* of mankind has been, is, and ever will be, the manifestation of the *Life* within them of the Living and Life-giving Word. "With thee," says the Holy Ghost by the Prophet David, "is the Fountain of *Life*; in Thy Light shall we see light."

It is the same process which is described in the parallel passage already referred to, the opening of S. John's first Epistle. Only there the beloved disciple traces it in a somewhat different order, backwards from the visible and tangible result to the absolute, eternal cause. "We have heard Him, we have seen Him with our eyes, we have looked upon Him, our hands have handled Him, who is the Word of Life;" and having been so made acquainted with Him, we tell you from Him, "this is the message which we have heard of Him, and declare unto you, that God is Light and in Him is no darkness at all." Here, on the other hand, the Apostle sets out from the Fountain—what our Lord is in Himself—and traces creating and redeeming Love all the way down to the moment in which he (S. John himself) with others beheld His glory"—(p. 19).

*The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* Illustrated in Lectures, Letters, and Tracts written between 1830 and 1841. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, of the Oratory, sometime Fellow of Oriol College. In Two Volumes. Vol. II. (London: Pickering.)

IN a recent number we noticed the first volume of this republica-

tion. We now remark briefly upon the second and somewhat miscellaneous volume, containing Mr. Newman's various tracts and pamphlets bearing more or less on the doctrines and *status* of the Anglican Church, published during the busy years from 1830 to 1845, the bustle and intellectual conflict of which was such as in all probability to predispose him to that comparative retirement from controversy which followed for a time the step which he took in 1845.

As illustrative of his course, we observe the attitudes in which we successively find him during those years. First we see him in 1830 coming forward as a patron of the Church Missionary Society, 'which I would fain see generally countenanced by the clergy,' and with proposals for its being 'legitimatised.' Then we have two dialogues on the *Via Media*, in which several things are clear, but not the meaning of the writer; for a more hesitating and involved attempt at definition we have seldom read. After this, the writer being as yet in his anti-Roman phase, follows a dissertation 'On the Mode of Conducting the Controversy with Rome' (No. 71 of the 'Tracts for the Times') which would to a considerable extent be tenable now. Dr. Newman, in his running fire of footnotes, hits trifling inaccuracies in outlying portions of the argument here and there, but as to its main positions, he has recourse to his unfailing argument—

'As to "points of faith," they accept them all on the *ground* that the infallible Church proposes them. If we doubt of some, why believe any? They all come on the same authority'—(p. 100).

Which is simply destructive of the power of spiritual discernment in those subjected to its sway. For if the faithful are just to swallow down with shut eyes whatever the spiritual tyranny calling itself 'infallible' offers to their acceptance, what place is possible for the growth of their spiritual judgment, or for their training in spiritual things? Then follow two letters on Holy Baptism and on the Eucharist, which show that he had reached the Anglican position on those subjects, but was as yet in strong antagonism to Rome.

In these letters there are premonitions of the famous Tract XC., which is here reprinted next in order, with the letter of the Four College Tutors, the resolution of the Hebdomadal Council, and Mr Newman's letter to the Vice-Chancellor avowing the authorship. After this his letter to Dr. Jelf defending the Tract; and another in the same year (1841) to the Bishop of Oxford, 'readily submitting' to withdraw it in deference to the Bishop's wishes, and expressing

'my great sorrow that any writing of mine should be judged objectionable by your lordship, and of a disturbing tendency, and my hope that in what I write in future I shall be more successful in approving myself to your lordship.

'I have reminded your lordship of my willingness on a former occasion to submit myself to any wishes of your lordship, had you thought it advisable at that time to signify them'—(p. 384).

It is an example of the irony of events that these somewhat profuse expressions of loyalty and submission to an Anglican bishop are followed by the author's 'Retraction of anti-Catholic Statements,

dated 'Littlemore, October 6, 1845,' as extracted from the advertisement of the Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, 'published by the author on his joining the Catholic Church.' Is it not an example of a mind which was *always in extremes*?

We lay down the volume with regret. Dr. Newman has the rare gift, as he showed in his 'Apologia,' of expressing his inmost moods of mind in fitting words, and of unveiling his most delicate mental processes with a simplicity which is the highest art. And so in these pages we have again been listening to an autobiography, or a fragment of one. The biographer of Dr. Newman will not want for materials.

*S. P. N. Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Alexandrini: De Recta Fide ad Imperatorem, De Incarnatione Unigeniti Dialogus, De Recta Fide ad Principissas, De Recta Fide ad Augustas, Quod unus Christus Dialogus, Apologeticus ad Imperatorem.* Edidit post AUBERTUM, PHILIPPUS EDWARDUS PUSEY, A.M. (Oxonii: Jac. Parker Soc.que.)

THESE treatises form parts of the fifth and sixth volumes of the great edition of S. Cyril, by Aubert, in seven volumes folio, which is, indeed, the only complete critical edition existing, so far as we are aware. Three treatises on the subject of the Incarnation, a dialogue on the same subject, and an apologetic address to the Emperor Theodosius II., explaining the course he had pursued at the Council of Ephesus, make up the volume of selections which Mr. Pusey has here presented to learned readers. It is characteristic of the time that the second and third of these tracts should be addressed to the little knot of ladies who then swayed the destinies of the Roman world; the first to Arcadia and Marina, younger sisters of the Empress Pulcheria; the second to Pulcheria and the accomplished Athenais, or Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius. The last was addressed to the Emperor himself, and was occasioned by a report spread by Cyril's enemies, that he was endeavouring to divide the Imperial family in opinion, in order to secure a party to himself. This was too much in accordance with the tactics of the age to be inherently absurd; but at all events, S. Cyril was able to appeal to the evident fact that he had addressed them in no improper or unbecoming manner, and that his only purpose in contending as he had done at the Council, was not to gain any private advantage for himself, but to promote the glory of God, and to guard the integrity of the Catholic faith.

The value of these writings is not high from a literary point of view. But they form one of the great sources from whence we obtain exact information respecting the heresies of that period. We learn in many cases the precise statements of Nestorius, Manes, Cerinthus, Photinus, and other heresiarchs; and their copious citations both from the Old and New Testaments render them a valuable authority for the text as it then existed. Mr. Pusey is doing an acceptable service to the Church by reissuing these little-known tracts in the handsome and convenient form of the volume before us. We trust it is to be regarded simply as an instalment.



*Chapters of Early English Church History.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (Clarendon Press.)

THIS work, the author tells us, is 'an expansion of lectures delivered to my class, while we had Bede's *History* before us, with a view to the Theological Final School.' We can only say that the undergraduates before whom they were read were much to be envied; and that the lectures, in their matured form, provide such a sketch of the beginnings of Church history among our English forefathers such as is nowhere else to be found; and will prove as acceptable to a wider circle of readers as we doubt not they have already proved to the smaller. The author, with his characteristic courtesy, acknowledges great obligations to the late Mr. Haddan and Professor Stubbs. Certainly from that peculiarly *national* school of historians, of which the latter is so distinguished an exemplar, he has drawn a pattern of patient industry and unswerving fidelity to facts, of which his own book is a striking instance. The thick array of notes at the foot of every page shows how much ground has been gone over in the composition of the history; and the result is a work of abiding value, and a permanent addition to the library.

The very first steps of the Gospel in Britain are so enveloped in doubt, the extant accounts so almost mythical in character, that it is with more regret than surprise we find them cavalierly negated by the present author. The theory that S. Paul once landed to preach the Gospel is dismissed in a word as a 'pious fancy,' nor does the Eastern origin of British Christianity fare much better. He sees, however, no reason to doubt the 'historic reality' of the martyrdom of the British Protomartyr, S. Alban. The grotesque mistake which turned the martyr's *amphibalus*, or large mantle, into the name of a man, his companion in martyrdom, he passes by with a word.

On the whole, he appears to us to be more in harmony with Saxon than with British Christianity. He vindicates, however, the essential Catholicity of the singular arrangement by which the primacy of the Northern sees belonged to one who was no bishop—the presbyter-abbot of Iona. We do not know what Canon Bright's authority may be for styling this Northern Church the Church of Alba, a term which strikes us as unusual.

Perhaps the most brilliant of all the sketches is that of the life of Wilfrid. It has an abundance of detail and a dramatic completeness which contrasts strongly with the conventional terms and the poverty of incident with which most of his contemporaries are recorded. He reminds us of no one so much as the great prelate-statesman or statesman-prelate three centuries after, in whom Wilfrid's love of appeals to Rome seemed to have revived again, and with results even more unhappy—we mean S. Thomas à Becket. We can hardly speak too highly of the care and particularity with which every part of his life is set in the fullest light and fitted into its place. About Wilfrid himself his biographer is enthusiastic; and although forced, as an English Churchman acquainted with Rome's later usurpations, to dislike

his persistent appeals to Rome, he admits much substantial justice in Wilfrid's protests themselves. He sums up the matter very fairly:—

‘Not so thought the great body of English clergy and laity at this time. They stood, indeed, in different degrees of obligation to the Roman Church. She was directly the mother-Church to Kent and also to Wessex, and indirectly to East-Anglia; in a limited sense, considering the retreat of Paulinus, to Northumbria; in a technical but ineffective sense, considering the failure of Mellitus, to Essex including London; in no sense at all, to wide-spreading Mercia. In so far as the several dioceses had been welded together in subordination to Canterbury, they were debtors through Canterbury to its spiritual parent; and they had all concurred in accepting Theodore as a special gift from the hands of Rome. They all, though probably not all with equal definiteness of conception, acknowledged in Rome a peculiar pre-eminence, a special heritage of Apostolic grace; to all of them the See of Peter was a title of august and sacred import, and they were too simple to analyse its significance or to test its grounds. But, with all this, they had not, as a body, in 678, any clear notion that gratitude or reverence could bind them to recognise a systematic interference on Rome's part in their domestic Church matters, by virtue of which any national Church decision might at any time be nullified by a court of appeal sitting far beyond the Alps. The aversion to “outlandish” authority, keen and strong in the insular mind even through the later Middle Ages, was now, in Northumbria, even scornfully incredulous as to any practical exercise of such authority; and, as far as we know, Benedict Biscop, with all that enthusiasm for Roman sanctities which repeated visits to Rome had fostered, never thought, on his return from the fifth of those visits, or afterwards, of taking Wilfrid's part in this quarrel’—(p. 287).

The account of another great English bishop, Cuthbert of Lindisfarne, seems to us somewhat meagre. But the character of Augustine is finely sketched; and the slowly progressive character of the establishment of Christianity in the island under Augustine and his immediate helpers and successors is made very clear. The frequent retrogressions too, which were incidents in its early history, are recorded, and will teach a useful lesson to those who are impatient with the slow rate of advance made by our own missions in this age.

On the whole, we cannot doubt that this able sketch of the *origines* of our Church will take the place of all others for the period which it embraces, and with the special class of students for whom it is intended.

*History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction.* By RICHARD WATSON DIXON, M.A., Vicar of Hayton. Vol. I., Henry VIII., A.D. 1529–1537. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co.)

THE Roman view of the Reformation regards it as simply a wicked revolt of the State of England against the authority of the Apostolic See, which was acquiesced in by the English Church. The Protestant looks upon it as a visible interposition of the Divine Providence in human things; he thinks its aims wholly good, and its actors the saints and heroes of the age in which they lived.

Between these two views there lies a third, which we may call the

*Anglican.* To an adherent of this middle term between two extremes the Reformation is a thing requiring neither to be unreservedly approved nor altogether deplored. He allows a justifiable reason for the movement, though not approving all that the Reformers said or did; and the general result is that the Reformation owes them less than it is the fashion, with friends and enemies alike, to declare; in a word, that the movement produced the leaders, and not the leaders the movement. They had the shaping of it in details, and in details it bears the marks of their hands to this day; but the great lines on which it was to move were settled beforehand, and were not their doing. The men of Henry the Eighth's time did not even settle the question whether there should be a Reformation or no. The King and his courtiers and his Commons may have provoked the immediate explosion, but it was an explosion which they had not prepared, and of which the combustible materials had been accumulating for ages. A reconstruction of ecclesiastical affairs was, in fact, due about that time, and would certainly have come somehow and somewhere—whether or no Henry had married his brother's widow and then a good while after came to see, or think he saw,

‘The Gospel light first dawn from Bullen's eyes.’

We are but indicating the view named above, and will not here pursue it farther. But it appears to us to be substantially the view maintained in the work before us, of which the first volume is but an instalment, comprehending the events of only eight years. They were eight very important years nevertheless; for during these took place the king's divorce, the Act of Submission of the clergy, the abolition of appeals to Rome, the deaths of More and Fisher, and the suppression of the monasteries, with a host of subsidiary and attendant events which would have been of first-rate importance in quieter times, but which, in the crash of still vaster interests, passed almost unregarded.

The great ideas which govern the present author's conception of the English Reformation, so far as they can be gathered from this part of his work, are two:—

1. He considers that a Reformation was needed, but that it might very well have been carried by the Church herself; and that from a Reformation it became well-nigh a destruction, by its being taken out of the hands of the clergy.

‘The study of the English Reformation, not pursued without considerable labour, has led me to the conclusion that at the time of the abolition of the Papal jurisdiction a reformation was needed in many things: but that it was carried out on the whole by bad instruments, and attended by great calamities. The Church was taken out of the hands of the clergy, to be managed by the laity. The king and the temporal estates overruled the spirituality. If the Church had been left to her proper officers to be reformed, and the needful compulsion given to them which it was always in the power of the king and temporality to apply, the state of the nation would have been better at this day. I shall endeavour in the course of my work to follow out the difficult question of the relation of the clergy to the reformatory movement—an important

question, to which the general answer is, that while the management of the Church in discipline and the temporalities may be said to have been taken from the clergy, and taken far more absolutely than seems generally thought, the reformation of doctrine was left to them in great measure; and yet by no means always left to them in their collective capacity, to their convocations or synods, to the Church representative, or assembly of the spirituality, but, in many important instances, assigned to certain of them sitting in commissions. A long chapter in the history of the Church of England is opened from the time of the abolition of the Papal authority; and the most comprehensive title of this would be, *Of the Church of England under Formularies of Faith and Acts for the Uniformity of Religion*—(p. 7).

2. Such a thrusting aside of the constitutional authorities of the Church, and such widespread spoliation of Church property, became possible by an extraordinary combination of dangerous circumstances, and specially by the character of the king himself. The power of the Crown had hitherto repressed the latent forces of the Revolution; but when, on the contrary, the sovereign encouraged them, and even put himself at their head, successful resistance was impossible:—

‘The ancient nobility had perished in the civil wars. Their place was being filled by a swarm of political adventurers, many of whom were among the worst men in the kingdom. New creations of nobility continued throughout the sixteenth century. These new men nearly all ranged themselves on the side of the party of innovation. At the head of all was a king who was more completely the man of the times than any person in his realm. A man of force without grandeur; of great ability, but not of lofty intellect: punctilious, and yet unscrupulous: centred in himself: greedy and profuse: cunning rather than sagacious: of fearful passions and intolerable pride, but destitute of ambition in the nobler sense of the word: a character of degraded magnificence. Such a king was no safe guardian of the rights of the realm. The only quality which preserved him from being a mere revolutionist was his cautious love of acting under constitutional and legal forms. A tremendous revolution in property—a revolution of the rich against the poor—was carried on in the latter years of Henry the Eighth; and was continued after his death by men whom he set up: but it was carried on, almost without exception, under some form of constitutional or legal procedure. That such a king was on the throne was the circumstance above all others which brought on the Reformation. The usual elements of disturbance were at work; but they might have been overruled, as they had been hitherto, but for Henry and his personal character and history. The laity had always been more or less opposed to the claims of the clergy: the patrimony of the Church had always been sapped by the avarice both of laymen, and not less of ecclesiastics and religious societies: proposals far more revolutionary, as regarded the endowments of the Church, than any that were carried at the Reformation had been made to the King of England in open Parliament a hundred years before: and the corruption of the clergy and the religious orders had been the theme of the satire of men who were themselves under no religious obligations, and owned no master but their will, for two centuries. But the King of England had hitherto stood in the gate to protect the one party from the other, and to preserve the rights of all. Now he lent the sanctity of the crown to an enormous devastation; and the elements which might have been controlled became uncontrollable. They raged: they gathered so much

voice and volume, as to have led to the common notion that they were now evoked by something rotten in the state of things which had not been in existence before, or had now at length overpassed all endurance. Whereas the waters had always been behind the floodgates, but he who letted them was not hitherto out of the way'—(p. 4).

The fault of this view is that it is too *insular*. The author does not take sufficient account of the great wave of religious disturbance which was then passing over the mind of Europe, and in which England shared to the full. What he says is true enough as far as it goes; but what he apparently fails to see is, that these causes which he truly enumerates, would have been altogether inadequate to bring about the result, unless the popular mind had been long and extensively prepared for them beforehand. The attack upon Church doctrines and Church property produced, as it was, something approaching to civil war more than once. Can any one doubt that if it had been begun, say a century earlier, by Henry VI. or Edward IV., it would have cost the assailant his crown, if not his life?

The Renaissance had, in fact, cut the ground from under belief to a considerable extent. And what the Renaissance did among the more cultured classes, the doctrines of Wickliffe, smouldering secretly under the surface, and betraying themselves only by the occasional surprise of a secret conventicle or the seizure of some prohibited books, had long been doing for the masses of the poor.

When, however, the author comes to describe the events by which in England itself the alteration was effected, this air of inadequacy leaves his work. He relates with great minuteness how the plot thickened from the Parliament of 1529 onwards, and how the king's advance towards the spoliation of Church property, at first hesitating and slow, became open, undisguised, and rapid, as soon as he found that he had the nation, or a sufficient part of it, at his back, and could command the willing assent of the House of Commons to whatever he pleased, as long as he asked nothing that touched themselves. Indeed, this part of Mr. Dixon's history is one long able arraignment of the violence, the hypocrisy, and the greed of Henry VIII. It might have been written as a 'counterblast' to Mr. J. A. Froude's often fulsome panegyric of the same monarch; and we think that few readers will doubt which of these portraits, each of them, perhaps, somewhat biassed, is nearer to the truth of history.

Very striking also is the narrative given in Chapter II. of the struggle between the king and the clergy in Convocation, the *Præmunire*, and the Act of Submission, in which the king was acknowledged (with the famous qualifying words) to be the Supreme Head of the Church of England. The author has an accurate and instinctive appreciation of what would be the feeling of a body of clergymen, which does much to increase the beauty and fidelity of the narrative. Of the entire incident, which most assuredly does no discredit to the English clergy, who were first most perfidiously entrapped into a *Præmunire*, and then crushed by superior force, he says:—

'The history of the conflict has not been preserved with exact accuracy amid the fame of the victory; and the glory of the conqueror has

been doubled by the singular process of detracting from the firmness and skill of his adversaries. But strict inquiry will teach us in great part to reverse the popular representations, and will make it apparent that the resistance of the defeated party was by no means inglorious; that the triumph of the victor, as far at least as words went, was not so complete as it is generally supposed; and that though the fruits of victory passed to the stronger, the honours of the day remained with the weaker of the combatants.

‘The clergy, who had granted away their money without difficulty, hesitated to acknowledge the supremacy in the new terms proposed. This is that mind of the clergy which seems inconceivable to some of the writers of English history. They were the official guardians of the Church; they knew the Church to be passing through a great crisis; and it seemed to them that if there were any necessity now to make a formal acknowledgment of the royal supremacy, it should be made in more moderate terms. It is owned, however, even by their avowed enemies that it was to their credit, whether they were right or wrong, that their resistance began upon points touching their position, not their purses’—(pp. 57, 64).

Not less interesting is his narrative of the suppression of the monasteries, and he shows cause (which we cannot now go into) for believing that much of the long black list of accusations against the ‘religious’ of that day has grown by inference and innuendo, and is not based on reliable statements. The historical foundation for such accusations is proved to grow smaller and smaller as we approach the times in which they belong; and, for many of the worst, there was never, as far as appears, any foundation at all.

This work, then, is on the whole well worth attention and perusal. The writer’s considerable acquaintance with the facts, and accurate conceptions of those facts, quite encourage us to believe that we shall have in it, when completed, a work of real historical value, which will, in many ways, correct current misconceptions of things and people; while the writer’s vigorous sarcasm, and power, and liveliness of style possess a charm of their own, which every reader will appreciate.

*On the Relations between England and Rome during the earlier portion of the Reign of Henry III.* By HENRY RICHARDS LUARD, B.D.,  
Editor of the ‘Chronica Majora of Matthew Paris.’ (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.)

INTO this pamphlet of some seventy pages Mr. Luard has compressed the results of much research, and has placed before us curious facts and tersely expressed comments, which possess a very real value and interest for the student of the history of the Church and of the history of England. Our limits compel us to content ourselves with only a brief notice (1) of a few of the facts, and (2) of a few of the inferences either expressed or implied by our author.

1. The period embraced is A.D. 1216–1235. This is only, as Mr. Luard’s title reminds us, a portion of the prolonged reign of Henry. (All the *thirds*, save Richard, were a long time on the throne



of England.) But there were two Bishops of Rome, Honorius III., elected in A.D. 1216, and his successor, Gregory IX., elected in A.D. 1227.

Certainly the facts here succinctly stated convey a vivid impression of the activity and energy of the Court and Church of Rome under Honorius III. Nothing seems too large, and nothing too trivial for notice. The French prelates who owe feudal obedience to Henry III. are bidden to haste to England that they may support his claim to the throne. The Archbishop of Dublin receives permission to reduce the monks in his province to a better state of discipline. The chapter of York is to restore the church of Bramham to the prior and canons of St. Oswald's, Nostell.<sup>1</sup> The dowry of Queen Berengaria, widow of Richard I., must be secured for her. Archbishop Gray, of York, is requested to confer a prebend on Roffrid, clerk to the Bishop of Ostia. The same archbishop is forbidden to carry his cross *erect* within the province of Canterbury. A commission, consisting of the Primate of the Southern Province (Langton), the Bishop of Lichfield, and the abbot of Fountains, is to examine the claims for canonization made on behalf of Hugh, late Bishop of Lincoln. The extortions carried on by Jews are inquired into. Isabella, the King's mother, is to desist from molesting her son. The Cistercians in England need not travel more than two days' journey from their monastery in any matter of legal trial. The barons, who decline (in A.D. 1224) to recognise the fact that King Henry is now of age, are threatened by Langton with excommunication. The Pope interferes on behalf of a great villain, Fawkes de Breauté. The pantheising treatise of Scotus Erigena *De Divisione Naturæ* is to be burnt, wherever it can be found. The Bishop of Salisbury (de Poore) is translated, in 1226, to Durham by a kind of compromise between the Pope and the Prior and Canons of Durham. Thus far we are concerned with Pope Honorius. Under Gregory IX., the Archbishop of Canterbury is directed to allay the discontent caused by the promotion of foreigners in England. Englishmen ought not to grumble on this score, since there is no acceptance of persons with God. In 1235, Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, is summoned to Rome, to aid the Pope against the Romans by his wealth and by his military skill. 'Gregory knew,' says Paris, 'that the Bishop had plenty of money, or, if not, that there was plenty in Winchester diocese, and the Pope preferred that the Bishop should spend his treasure in his service rather than in that of any other.'

2. We have tried to emulate the fairness of Mr. Luard by selecting cases of interference which wear an unfavourable complexion, as well as those which tended to the benefit of the realm. On the whole, however, few impartial students of history can doubt that the Papacy of the thirteenth century, though at times mistaken, and unduly meddlesome, was doing a good and righteous work for England, and one which no other power then existent could discharge.

The view of Mr. Luard has been truly described as somewhat

<sup>1</sup> We presume Nostell Priory, in Yorkshire, now the seat of a great county family, the Winns.

more favourable to the Roman Pontiff than that of the average of English annalists of our day. But this is no reason for not giving him a hearing. Those who would refuse it would have refused it thirty or forty years ago to Hurter, Vogt, Palgrave, Arnold, and above all to Guizot, when they stepped forward to plead for a reversal of the narrow, spiteful, and untenable verdict delivered by the sceptics of the eighteenth century. Any interval of difference between Mr. Luard and the writers we have named must be slight indeed when compared with the gulf that severs them from the school of Hume and Mably and Voltaire.

Nevertheless we own that we are not quite prepared to take a further step with Mr. Luard, though we are quite as little inclined to go back in company with one whom many of us regard as a most over-rated personage, the late Bishop Thirlwall. A word as regards the past and the present is all that we can get set down to indicate our shade of difference. Mr. Luard speaks in terms of warm eulogy of Stephen Langton, and of the debt we owe to Innocent III. for giving England such a noble Primate. Most just; but then is not Milman right, for once at least, in representing as part of the merit of Langton his grand spirit of independence? Langton 'remembered not only that he was an Archbishop, but that he was an Englishman, and a noble of England. He had asserted with the Pope the liberties of the Church against the King; he asserted the liberties of England against the same King, though supported by the Pope.' Is there, we sorrowfully ask, a glimmer of any such feeling on the part of modern Roman prelates in England? Could we, who see a Cardinal Manning anxious to crush the liberties of Italy, trust him for a single day with a cause involving the liberties of England? Dr. Newman might possibly try to conciliate both points (the cause of the tiara and that of national freedom), but then Dr. Newman is no cardinal, nor archbishop, no, nor a bishop, nor even a *Monsignore*! Better days may be in store. Mr. Dale, the eminent Nonconformist minister, said on the gathering of the Vatican Council, 'Let us pray not *against* Rome, but *for* Rome;' and so, too, we would pray (as in fact we do pray in the Litany), that 'it may please God to govern His holy Church universal in the right way;' and hope that He may raise up a ruler to the largest communion in Christendom, who may cherish towards us sentiments like those of Urban VIII. rather than those of Pio Nono.

[As the concluding sentence of this notice may be thought to have been penned with special reference to the decease of Pius IX. and the election of Leo XIII., we think it right to say that the MS. reached us in January last, though too late for our issue of that quarter.—Ed. C. Q. R.]

*Lectures on Mediæval Church History.* Being the Substance of Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin, Chancellor of the Order of S. Patrick. (Macmillan and Co.)

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH has here re-edited and published certain

Courses of Lectures delivered many years ago at Queen's College. Those who have a similar auditory in view, cannot do better than put this book into their hands. And there is no attempt at making its subjects too easy, for the author clearly avows his conviction, in which we entirely agree, that 'there is no need to break the bread of knowledge smaller for young women than young men.'

As to the Lectures, they are intended as an introduction to the study, and they form a very good one. The plan is that each lecture shall give a notion of a school or of a period, and it is but mere justice to say that it is carried out with wonderful success, and the book is one which few readers will lay down unfinished. The highly allusive nature of the style, too, is singularly provocative of further study, and must doubtless have stimulated the curiosity of some of those who heard them, and so have been the occasion of a good deal of healthy self-discipline. On the other hand, a careless or ill-prepared reader would find much in these pages that was unintelligible. And the lecturer's exquisitely balanced and philosophical style would perhaps rarely be appreciated as it deserves by readers to whom force and directness are the first of merits. But they are valuable lectures and especially so with reference to the Scholastics and the Mystics. We do not know any book suitable to be used in education, which covers exactly the same ground; and the Archbishop has done a service to the young of the upper and middle classes by giving it to the world.

*The Authorship of the De Imitatione Christi.* By SAMUEL KETTLEWELL, M.A., late Vicar of St. Mark's, Leeds. (London: Rivingtons.)

IN secular literature it is rare to find a book which has created an impression and come down to posterity, and has yet remained anonymous. On the side of readers gratitude and curiosity come into play; on the side of writers vanity and love of fame. Cicero observes that philosophers, who had written treatises on the contempt of glory, took care to inscribe their names upon the parchments. Occasional exceptions, such as fragments of Greek and of Scottish poetry, or the *Letters of Junius*, rather establish than disprove the general rule. But when we turn to sacred literature the case is somewhat altered. The authorship of several books of the Bible is either unknown or a matter of dispute; as, for instance, the Books of Chronicles and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nor is this feature confined to the Jewish or the Christian canon. The writers of the earliest books held sacred by the Hindoos are unknown, and there is much difficulty in deciding how far Zoroaster was the author, how far only the editor of the *Zendavesta*.

It is singular that there should be a like uncertainty respecting the authorship of that work which, next to the Bible, has for many centuries been, of all religious books, the most popular in Western Christendom. The *De Imitatione Christi* has been again and again translated into every European tongue; but, whether the tradition

which assigns it to Thomas à Kempis is correct or not, is still, in some measure, a question *sub judice*.

The volume before us is a disquisition on this subject, but its author has not unnaturally been led on to consider other points; such as the general excellence of the book, and the possibility of its author being a precursor of the Reformation. We can only bestow a few words on each head.

1. Mr. Kettlewell contends that one of the claimants (or rather one of those for whom the *De Imitatione* is claimed), Gersen of Vercelli, must be put out of court as a phantom, or, at any rate, as a man whose existence has yet to be proved. Here he seems to have a strong case. The Chancellor Gerson is, of course, no phantom, but a very real man, whose claims have been much advocated on the Continent, and who has recently received in England the support of Dr. Farrar. Mr. Kettlewell's seventeenth chapter supplies solid grounds, both from reason and authority, for the rejection of Gerson, though we do not feel so confidently as our author does on the particular points at issue upon this head between him and the Canon of Westminster. When we come to the positive evidence on behalf of Thomas à Kempis, Mr. Kettlewell chiefly follows the *Scutum Kempense* of Eusebius Amort, a work to which he most fully acknowledges his obligations. The external evidence is first adduced, and then attention is called to a really curious and interesting feature (which will probably be new to many of our readers as it certainly was to us), namely, the similarity of the rhythmical flow of many parts of the *De Imitatione* to that traceable in acknowledged writings of à Kempis. This seems to us the strongest part in Mr. Kettlewell's case on behalf of his client. We must, in fairness, say that many of the other traits of resemblance adduced in chapter xxvi. of this work would not greatly move us, if they stood simply by themselves. But Mr. Kettlewell may urge that they do not stand by themselves, but must be regarded in the light of so much subsidiary evidence.

2. On the defence of the character of the book as against a certain class of censors, we are entirely with our author. If, for example, the *De Imitatione* be charged with omission of the duties incumbent on a Christian man considered as a citizen, its author would have replied that he did not profess to treat of that aspect of our religion, but that the man who cherished the graces which he is here recommended, *Deo favente*, to cultivate, would prove to be not only a good brother within a monastery, but also a good husband, father, and citizen, if his vocation lay outside the convent walls. Next to the love of God *ought* to come the love of our own souls; and the really religious man will prove truly philanthropic, because he will learn to consider both tables of the law, and to look upon acts of love towards man as stepping-stones towards the love of God. But we will not attempt to add one to the many admirable eulogies so deservedly pronounced upon the *De Imitatione Christi*. Several are wisely cited in the book before us.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Kettlewell should correct, with all speed, the singular *lapsus* (at p. 20) of calling Leibnitz a *French* author. No doubt he wrote a great

3. On the third point Mr. Kettlewell does not convince us. Of course, all the really spiritually-minded men of the middle ages did, both in life and morals, utter and enact a protest against practical corruptions, such as Lingard says, with only too much truth, must always exist 'in old and wealthy establishments.' Hence the fondness of Martin Luther for the works of Tauler, of S. Bernard, nay even of that extremely Roman Catholic writer, Bonaventure. But a great part of Mr. Kettlewell's argument might, in our judgment, be employed to prove that numbers of undoubted Romanists (we do not use the word opprobriously) were Reformers before the Reformation. Look at S. Anselm. How little there is in his *Monologium*, in his *Cur Deus Homo*, nay, even in his *Meditationes*, to which the keenest ultra-Protestant can object. And yet we know that S. Anselm was, in action, a firm supporter of the Papacy; indeed, much more so (perhaps in consequence of the fury of William Rufus) than Lanfranc, Grossetête, and many others whom we might name.

Further study of history will, we suspect, lead Mr. Kettlewell to modify a good many of his *obiter dicta*. His natural veneration for the pastor under whom he first served, the late Dean of Chichester, may possibly render him too apt to accept all the rulings laid down in Dr. Hook's writings as absolutely final. But Dr. Hook would, we believe, have questioned the correctness of many of the assumptions in this volume. Fuller acquaintance with such lives as those of S. Louis of France, and with such works as those of S. Thomas Aquinas, will surely convince Mr. Kettlewell that a very real and fervid love of the Saviour of mankind might co-exist with a sincere belief that the persecution of heretics was a duty. These, however, are problems of psychology, on which we have no space to enter. If our impressions concerning them do not entirely coincide with those of our author, we are none the less grateful to him for having produced a very interesting volume, on a subject on which no other work in the English language supplies so much valuable information in so good a tone. The research employed in producing it has evidently been a labour of love, and such labours seldom fail to display merits peculiarly their own.

*Eternal Hope.* Five Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey, November and December, 1877. By the REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster. (Macmillan and Co., 1878.)

CANON FARRAR'S object in his Sermons on *Eternal Hope* is to substitute for the literal expectation of everlasting torment a belief which he maintains to be more primitive, Scriptural, and Catholic than either the modern Roman doctrine of Purgatory, or the two theories of Restorationism and Conditional Immortality, of the recent supporters of which opinions he nevertheless speaks with

deal in French, but so did Sismondi, Heine, Horace Walpole, and many more. It will hardly be safe for our author to travel in Germany until he restores to her the greatest genius she possessed at the date when Leibnitz flourished.

much respect and sympathy. The volume will attract readers by the publicity of the controversy which followed the delivery of the Sermons ; and their interest will be retained and kept up by the author's evident sincerity of purpose, and by the rapid rush of his impetuous rhetoric. But the arguments will scarcely convince any one who is not predisposed to conviction, and the lines of the reasoning are not drawn with sufficient steadiness and clearness to make the book, as it stands, a permanent addition to the literature of this solemn subject. Canon Farrar dwells with his usual emphatic energy on the more awful aspects of the common creed, so far as it teaches that physical torments of inconceivable terror are to be finally allotted at death to the majority of mankind, and are to be borne through an absolutely endless duration. He declares himself, however, unable to avail himself of the escape which is offered by either of the two theories named above, on the ground that neither can claim an uncontradicted support from Holy Scripture, and that the doctrine of partial annihilation, in particular, does not commend itself to the enlightened conscience. At the same time he repudiates the accretions which have gathered round the doctrine of Purgatory as a legacy from mediæval theology. Nor can he rest satisfied, like Bishop Martensen, and perhaps Bishop Thirlwall, with the admission 'that alike universal restoration and never-ending torments are unequivocally taught in Scripture, and that therefore in Scripture, as in life, there are insoluble antinomies' (p. 225). Admitting in their utmost force the arguments on which these several theories are grounded, he believes that he has found repose in a creed more 'ancient and noble' than any of them ; the belief that opportunities falling short of Purgatorial fire will be extended to mankind after the death of the body, whereby the lingering imperfections of our present characters may be amended, and the stains of sin may be finally washed out, and the soul may be thus fitted for the Beatific Vision :—

'It was a deep misfortune to the Church that, while rejecting Purgatory, the reformers did not distinguish it from the widespread ancient, reasonable, and, I had almost said, necessary, belief in some condition in which—by what means we know not, whether by the *pœna sensûs* or only the *pœna damni*—imperfect souls who die in a state unfit for heaven may yet have perfected in them until the day of Christ that good work of God which has been in this world begun' (Preface, p. xix).

'It seems to me that if many passages of Scripture be taken *quite literally*, universal restoration is unequivocally taught, just as, if many passages be taken quite literally, the final annihilation of the wicked is taught ; but that *endless torments are nowhere clearly taught*—the passages which appear to teach that doctrine being obviously figurative or historically misunderstood. If the decision be made to turn *solely on the literal* meaning of Scripture, I have no hesitation whatever in declaring my strong conviction that the universalist and annihilist theories have far more evidence of this sort for them than the popular view. It may be asked, Why then am I unable to adopt the universalist opinion ? The answer is simple. It is because one or two passages—though far more than their due significance seems to have been attributed to them—seem to make it unwise to speak dogmatically on a matter which God has not clearly revealed. Comparing Scripture with Scripture, limiting Scrip-



ture by Scripture, and judging of Scripture—as we are encouraged and taught to do—by that spirit of man which is the candle of the Lord, I see no tenable view but that ancient and noble one which I have here tried—alas ! very imperfectly, but to the best of my power under present circumstances—to set forth and to defend' (p. 225).

In his wish to return to a more primitive theology, Canon Farrar would meet with a large amount of sympathy. But his actual treatment of the subject leads him, as in the second of the above passages, to raise so weak a barrier against universalism, that in spite of his sincere and honest protest, the evidence of his 'one or two' texts will be swept away, and, whatever he may think or wish, the universalists will be the real gainers from his ardent declamation. They will strengthen his guarded hope into a fixed conviction, 'that, even after death, through the infinite mercy of the loving Father,' (more than) 'many of the dead shall be alive again, and the lost be found' (p. 54) ; they will insist that this 'hope for the future' shall be extended to more than only 'many of the lost' (p. 59, note). And it is easy to find passages in which he himself enlarges this hope, from the future prospects of imperfect goodness, to reach the cases of men who have left this world in a state of unrepented sin :—

'If you ask me whether I must not believe in endless torments for these reprobates of earth, my answer is, Ay, for these, and for thee and for me too, unless we learn with all our hearts to love good and not evil ; but whether God for Christ's sake may not enable us to do this even beyond the grave, if we have failed to do so in this life,—I cannot say. I know that God hates sin, because He loves the soul which it destroys . . . yet I know also that for these Christ died. The bigot may judge their souls if he likes ; the Pharisee may consign them with conventional orthodoxy to endless torment ; but so cannot and will not I . . . If, as we look into the abyss of our own hearts, we see infinite potentialities of guilt and vice, so, as I look on these, I see in them, in spite of all their shame and stain, the infinite potentialities of virtue . . . That without holiness none can see God ; that every guilty deed, if unrepented of, must bring its own just and awful retribution ; that for every impure and cruel soul there remaineth, behind the clouds of this world, the dark night of the next ; that I know. But when I remember that even these have been known to burst into tears at a mother's name ; that even these have been known at times to flash out into high deeds of momentary heroism—I see that God's spirit has nowhere taught us that He who gave cannot give back ; that He who once made them innocent children, cannot restore their innocence again : that He who created them,—He who will have all men to be saved,—cannot recreate them in His own image, cannot uncreate their sins. At any rate no arrogant word, no theologic dogma, no acrid prejudice of mine, shall ever utter to them the language of despair, or stand between these—God's lowest—and His love. Nay, I believe that the Good Shepherd, for so He Himself has told us, will not cease to search for these, His lost sheep, *until* He find them'—(pp. 104–108).

Here the Canon takes a very long step in advance of the language of that previous quotation, in which he spoke only of 'imperfect souls who die in a state unfit for heaven,' and who 'may yet have *perfected* in them until the day of Christ that good work of God *which has*

*been in this world begun.*' And surely the universalist would be most unreasonably exacting who was not very grateful for the above vigorous statement of what is so hard to distinguish from his own opinion. Was there ever a universalist who maintained that God will save men in and with their sins, or that the actually impure can enter heaven?

Canon Farrar spends a large amount of criticism on the three words on which the controversy mainly turns; hell, damnation, and everlasting. He declares that no revision of the English Bible will be satisfactory in which these terms are not all retranslated, or, better still perhaps, in two of the three cases, retained from the original language in an English dress. But he seems to forget that behind the English version there lies a long consensus of Scripture interpretation which ranges over more than a millennium; and that when the Bible has been revised, we shall then have to deal with the English wording of the Creeds and Prayer Book. For 'hell,' in particular, he points out that three different words will be required; Tartarus for 2 Pet. ii. 4; Hades for the unseen world; Gehenna for the (symbolical) place of torment. The word *αἰώνιος* causes him much more perplexity. He would probably accept the translation 'eternal,' if he could get rid of 'everlasting'; yet at one time he translates it 'age-long or æonian,' though confessing that 'æonian' can perhaps hardly be naturalised' (pp. 78, 197). At another time he speaks of 'æonian punishment' (p. xxxix); in many places we find the 'Gehenna of æonian fire' (pp. 88, 132, 143, 148, 153). We are inclined to regard his criticisms on this word 'æonian' as the weakest of his philological arguments. Supposing we grant that the term is only relative, and is to be measured by the *ævum* with which it is connected. Yet surely the coming *ævum* (Heb. vi. 5), the sphere of eternity, is the *ævum* of the ageless age of God. If human terms of duration are infinitely inadequate to measure the existence which shall ensue when there 'shall be time no longer,' it is because eternity is inconceivably grander, more changeless, more durable than time; because eternity combines the absolute unity and perfection of what time exhibits only in successive fragments; and the incapacity of human words to measure the steadfast changelessness of eternity can be no reason for degrading it with any tincture of the changefulness of time, by refusing to call it 'endless' or 'everlasting.'

His argument compels him of necessity to underestimate the probationary character of our present lives. If it is true, as he appears to teach, that the soul after death is to be submitted by God's mercy to fresh trial after trial, and if all are at last to be rescued except the possible but doubtful few who may persistently resist those trials, and remain for ever hardened in obdurate rebellion, we have to reinterpret all the Scripture declarations which have been always held to teach the paramount importance of the present life. We must no longer believe that Scripture is to be taken in its obvious sense when it teaches that 'the harvest is the end of the world'; that the second advent of Christ will be the signal for the general resurrection; that when the Son of Man comes in the glory of His Father with His angels, 'then He shall reward every

man according to his works ;' that ' we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.' Canon Farrar's eager declamation loses all its force unless he believes that Scripture really means to extend our probation, as well as our purgation, beyond the grave. But how mighty is the difference which is thus introduced into the prospect of the future ! How great is the danger lest such teaching should weaken or postpone the sense of present responsibility ! It is one thing to maintain the possibility of some future condition in which imperfect souls shall be made perfect, and shall be cleansed from all the lingering sins which too often haunt the secret recesses even of the obedient heart. It is quite another thing to suggest that there may even yet be a perpetual renewal of our chances ; and that this life, in which our blessed Saviour shared, this life on which we had believed that such momentous issues had been meant to depend,—that this life may possibly count for scarcely anything in that final determination which shall decide our position and our work for eternity.

*Philochristus. Memoirs of a Disciple of the Lord.* (Macmillan and Co.)

THERE are two ways of regarding a book, and there are accordingly two ways of criticising it. You may regard it simply with reference to its avowed aim, and inquire into the worthiness of that aim, the manner in which it is pursued, the knowledge and skill brought to bear upon the subject, and the measure of success which has attended the effort. Or, secondly, disregarding for the moment such questions as the foregoing, you may accept the book as it stands, and treat it with reference to what it shows as to the standpoint of the writer ; or, again, as an indication of the tendencies, or the needs, or the aspirations of the age to which the writer belongs.

*Philochristus* is a book which, to our thinking, is interesting in the latter point of view chiefly ; as to the details of the book itself, we will add a few remarks presently. Viewed, however, as a witness to the characteristics and tendencies of the present moment, it is not without value. It is utterly 'rationalistic ;' it cannot accept the 'supernatural,' and yet it affords the strongest testimony to the unique and peculiar attraction—we know not what other word to use—inherent in the character and the teaching of the Christ of our Gospels. The writer is as far as possible from being what anyone could call 'orthodox,' and in what sense he regards our Lord as divine it is impossible for us, and we should think not easy for him, to define. Yet for all that he is evidently under a spell as he contemplates His character—it attracts him, it subdues him ; he approaches it with a reverent awe, he is ready to surrender himself to its mysterious influence, and he would like to render some account to himself of the reason why he is thus ready to yield himself to the charm. At the same time, while regarding Him with as much mysterious awe as you please, and ready in a certain sense to yield *himself* to the great Teacher, the writer is not in the smallest degree disposed to surrender his *objections* to the supernatural *quâ* supernatural, and though all his know-

ledge of the Lord is of necessity derived from our Gospels, he is as far as possible from accepting any portion of their supernatural element, excepting only that which is perhaps the greatest marvel of all, namely, the miraculously impressive character of the Lord Himself. *That*, as we said above, he accepts with a real, loving awe and reverence—we use the word reverence advisedly, for it is more than respect, it is reverential awe. The words of the Lord find a response in his spirit; he feels their spiritual power, he bows before it, he acknowledges it. The curious thing is that the modern prejudice against miracles and the supernatural entirely prevent him from drawing the otherwise inevitable inference as to the nature of the Being who excites the feelings which he expresses.

After this our readers will not be surprised at our going on to say that the book is both hesitating in its conception and faltering in its details. It is not definitely humanistic, for it is full of vague outlooks towards the divine which would make the thoroughgoing humanitarian put it aside as none of his. It is equally removed from the unmistakable claim to divinity which is clear enough in the Synoptics, and which is the special subject of S. John. Hence, however typical of the age from which it proceeds, it is peculiarly unsatisfactory, whether viewed as a portrait of its divine subject, or as a reason for the reverence with which He is regarded.

Essentially, if not formally, it is a study of the life of Christ cast into the shape of a narrative, supposed to be written by a contemporary who had been numbered among His followers, and one who in extreme old age, ten years after the destruction of Jerusalem, dedicates his work 'to the Saints of the Church in Londinium.' So, then, it is not so much a picture of the Lord, as an account of the impression supposed to have been made by the Lord upon an inquiring and receptive contemporary. He sketches the ignorance, the vacillation, the misconception of even the best and purest of the Lord's contemporaries; and save in its intensely modern tone, its intense anachronisms of thought, its habitual preference for the abstract and the vague over the concrete and definite, and its systematic avoidance of the supernatural, it is something like that which the post-apostolic ages knew as the Apocryphal Gospels. From the writer's point of view this method has the singular advantage of dealing with the ministry of our Lord and that alone, and thus avoids the entire cycle of the miraculous conceptions surrounding His birth, which, if we read the book rightly, its writer would equally shrink from rejecting or accepting. Perhaps the best part of the book lies in its sketch of the state of parties and of the public mind at the time of the Incarnation, and of the expectations of a Messiah amidst which our Lord's earthly career was cast. But the picture of our Lord Himself strikes us as deplorably weak, and though not without a certain sweetness, yet utterly inadequate to account for the very veneration with which the writer evidently regards Him. Looking to the actual record in the Gospels, there is everywhere a stamp of power about the character and actions of the Lord, which is at least as remarkable as the ineffable tenderness with which it was associated

and interpenetrated. In the picture given by 'Philochristus' we see one whose teaching was half made up of sighs, of sad looks, and not unfrequently of total silence; one, too, whose acts and sayings have an air of dislocation incompatible with perfect humanity, and a certain lack of manliness and force which does not tend to inspire respect. Supposing for a moment that the Jesus of 'Philochristus' were the reality, it would be simply unthinkable that anyone could have constructed therefrom so inconceivably grand and dignified a character as the Jesus of the Gospels. Of course the Resurrection is a stumbling-block, and the Body of our Lord is supposed to have been made away with by the Sanhedrim while his subsequent appearances are resolved into the figments of excited imaginations, predisposed to believe in them—a hypothesis curiously at variance with the confession of the Evangelists, that in spite of His predictions our Lord's disciples were *not* predisposed to believe in His resurrection. Occasionally 'Philochristus' throws a side light worth noting upon detached incidents and discourses; but, as a whole, it is only another example of the hopelessness of constructing a *reasonable* account of the influence of the Christ-character on any hypothesis short of that of the Gospels themselves. The interest of the book lies in its testimony to the attractiveness of that character, even to those who do not accept it in its fulness; and this is at least a hopeful symptom, for which we cannot be too thankful.

*The Origin and Development of Religious Belief.* By S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. Part I. Polytheism and Monotheism. Part II. Christianity. Two Volumes. (London: Rivingtons.)

THIS is a new edition and in a very convenient form. Any possible reader of Mr. Baring-Gould's really remarkable treatises will here find what will be to him an intellectual feast of no common kind. We should suppose, however, that the 'fit audience' Mr. Baring-Gould would thus find would unhappily be too few. The work is too highly intellectualised for the multitude; and so far as we ourselves are concerned we should not dare, unless we could devote forty or fifty pages of the *Church Quarterly* to the task, to attempt to review it. When we mention that the author sketches the entire circle of the religious ideas, and touches more or less remotely on most or all of the great systems of philosophy, it will be seen that we could not attempt a formal review of it within the limits to which we are here confined. All those, however, whose duty or choice it is to verify their beliefs, and to establish a *concordat* for their own and others' use, between the religious ideas which we inherit from the past, and the scientific ones which the present age generates with such profusion, will find valuable help from Mr. Baring-Gould's pages. But probably in the course of their perusal they will find much to excite a good deal of intellectual combativeness—if they have any, which readers of such a calibre are sure to have.

*Faith and Philosophy.* Discourses and Essays. By HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., LL.D. Edited with an Introductory Notice by GEORGE L. PRENTISS, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, in the City of New York. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

THIS goodly volume forms the memorial of an able, highly gifted, and finely cultured man. Dr. Smith was a professor in the Union Theological Seminary in New York; and was justly considered, says his biographer, as 'representing whatever is highest and best in American culture and scholarship.' He had, however, not confined his studies to American institutions, having studied for a considerable time at Halle and also at Berlin, at which places he was the contemporary of great German scholars.

These essays are worthy of careful and leisurely perusal. But it must be the perusal of scholars. The great erudition and power of robust and earnest thought which they display, will be unintelligible to others; and will tax the attention even of them. It must be added to this, that they are generally very long. We cannot call them diffuse, and it would be hard to say, where a paragraph or even a single line could be spared. But the affluence of the writer's stores of thought, and thoroughness of his mental habit, rather tend to tire those who are not as well furnished as himself.

Still there is not one of these essays but is at once able and interesting. But the reader will, perhaps, regard with special satisfaction, the masterly review on the 'New Latitudinarians of England' and those upon Renan and Strauss. In contrasting the two, much to the disadvantage of the Frenchman, he says with characteristic felicity of phrase, 'The Gospels that have borne the brunt of the catapult need not shrink from the flight of the arrow'—(p. 411). And how carefully expressed and well packed is the following:—

'A philosophic unbeliever resolves revelation into intuition, miracles into the course of nature *plus* myths, inspiration into genius, prophecy into sagacious historic conjectures, redemption into the victory of mind over matter, the incarnation into an ideal union of humanity with divinity realised in no one person, the Trinity into a world process, and immortal life into the perpetuity of spirit bereft of personal subsistence. He takes the wondrous volume in which all these truths and facts are embodied and embalmed, and which on that very account is the unique wonder and the very marvel of all literature, and demands that it shall be interpreted just like any other book, not merely in its words, but in its inmost sense; that its histories, its prophecies, its miracles, its sacred truths, shall be subjected to the standard by which we try the words and explain the sense of Herodotus and Plato, of Virgil and Tacitus, of Dante and Bacon. All in it that is supernatural, all that discriminates it as a specific revelation, is to be adjudicated by natural laws and reason'—(p. 169).

And, in fact, the style here and elsewhere is perfect, terse, powerful and brilliant—a very model. The only regret we feel in perusing the volume is that its accomplished and pious author was not a Churchman. '*Cum tu talis esses, utinam noster fuisses?*'



There are some (not unfrequent) errors of the press in this edition, 'Farrer' for 'Farrar,' 'reduction' for 'redaction,' and such like.

*The Cross of Christ: Studies in the History of Religion and the Inner Life of the Church.* By Rev. OTTO ZÖCKLER, D.D., Professor of Theology in Greifswald. Translated, with the co-operation of the Author, by the Rev. MAURICE J. EVANS, B.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

A MONOGRAPH on the Cross considered as a devotional symbol may seem to have grown beyond limits in occupying four hundred and fifty octavo pages. But any one who has ever looked into—for it is hardly conceivable that any one should have read Gretzer's enormous work *De Cruce Christi rebusque ad eam pertinentibus*, which is in three folio volumes—will credit the author with considerable moderation. His work contains many curious and little-known facts as to the early history of the adoration of the Cross as it is attested to this day upon pre-Christian monuments. In his second chapter he treats of the Cross upon Calvary, which he holds to have been of the traditional form, in opposition to the opinion—now, we should suppose, an extinct one—which regards it as a three-armed or *Tau* Cross. Chap. III. describes the place which the Cross filled in the devotional practice of the early Church, the custom of signing with it, and the gradual growth of the Cross cultus. Constantine's vision, considered as a new starting-point for this devotion, occupies a chapter to itself; and in the two following, V. and VI., 'The Cross in the Church of the Middle Ages' and 'The Cross in the Theology and Church of the Reformation,' the inquiry culminates. To the men who lived in the Middle Ages the Cross was the mystical symbol of the Christian religion, and was woven in a thousand ways, by painting, by architecture, by ritual, and by the arts, into the life of the age. From this chapter we will give one extract, referring to one embodiment of this idea, the architectural:—

'With more animation, and at the same time with more elegance, than the Romanesque cathedrals—many of which, in their reproduction of the form of the Cross, displayed immoderately colossal proportions, such as, *e.g.*, the great Church of the Monastery at Clugny, with its two cruciform choirs, the one towards the east and the other towards the west; or the cathedrals of Languedoc, with their high side-aisles surrounding the whole building, even to the cross-arms of the choir—do the GOTHIC churches represent the cruciform principle in the abundant fulness of its characteristic power of production; in the delicate spires or pointed turrets, regularly ornamented above with cross-flowers, which crown the pillared buttresses as well as the projecting roofs or dormers (*Wimberge*) of the roofing; in the network of girdles and ribs, by which the panels of the cross vaulting appear as at the same time adorned and supported; in the ornamentation of the high-pointed windows, displaying ever more glorious star-like, radiated, or rose-shaped figures, and yet never untrue to the fundamental idea of the Cross; in the transverse section of the pillars, likewise ever attaining to more and more complicated rosette forms, and yet also on their part firmly retaining the characteristic figure of the Cross, &c. Indeed it would appear that, like as the peculiar characteristic which distinguishes an animal or vegetable organism is even

performed in the minutest of the countless cellular structures out of which it is composed, so here the design of the Cross, after which the whole was constructed, has been imprinted even upon the single component elements. The whole building presents itself, in its harmonious oneness as a marvellously transparent embodiment of a profoundly Christian idea.' —(p. 189).

The book is able, and full of interesting matter, and though, like many German works, terribly prolix, is seldom dull. It will be an acquisition to English readers.

*The Four Gospels, as interpreted by the Early Church: a Commentary on the authorised English Version of the Gospel according to S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John, compared with the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and Alexandrian MSS., and also with the Vulgate.* By FRANCIS HENRY DUNWELL, B.A., Vicar of Hensall. (London: William Clowes and Sons.)

THE title of this work must be scrutinised carefully, or we shall form an incorrect notion of what we are to expect in it. It is not an ordinary commentary upon the Gospels, but an exposition founded on the writings of the early Fathers exclusively, and for any hint we glean from its pages, there might be no such literature as the German existing in the world. It would be harsh to call such a book an anachronism; we prefer to consider it to have been written for a homiletic purpose exclusively, and to have excluded the critical element of set purpose. This premised, we think it an industrious, scholarly, and pious compilation, well printed, and thoroughly suitable to its apparent purpose, that of arranging and condensing the voluminous comments of Patristic writers within a reasonable limit, and laying the result ready for the clergyman's use. It is a useful purpose, and it is well fulfilled.

*A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians.* By the late JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

THE late Dr. Eadie left in MS. at his death the Commentary which is here published under the editorship of the Rev. P. Young of Parkhead. It is a pious, painstaking, and intelligent comment on the text with fairly adequate critical introduction and brief account of the literature of the subject. To have given the Greek text of the Epistles would have added much to its usefulness. As it stands, the book can hardly be used as a class book without inconvenience. But it realises, we think, what Dr. Cairns says of it in his preface, that 'there is the same penetration and sagacity in tracing the course of argument, the same unflinching sympathy with the deepest thoughts and lessons of inspiration.'

*The Argument from Prophecy.* By the Rev. BROWNLOW MAITLAND, M.A. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THE fundamental principle of this treatise is that the argument from prophecy ought to be viewed as a whole, and not divided into parts.

The author allows that it might be difficult to establish the inspiration of, e.g. Isaiah or Jeremiah individually from the predictions of future events to be found in their writings, and that in any case the argument from a single fulfilled prediction to the cogency of a command enunciated by the same writer, is here, as elsewhere, illegitimate.

A quotation, somewhat long, indeed, will exactly define his position, and as the book has been the occasion of some controversy, we make no apology for putting the whole before our readers :—

‘And if a single prediction is not sufficient to carry with it a proof of inspiration, the multiplication of instances would not necessarily add the confirmation that is needed. The marvel would be heightened, and the explanation rendered more difficult ; but still the element of divineness would not be satisfactorily established. Just as in the case of an alleged miracle, more, far more, than the bare wonder itself is needed to turn it into a witness of divine intervention ; the whole moral and spiritual environment is an essential feature of the case, and enters largely into its determination.

‘But suppose that instead of a single incidental prediction or two, we met with a long connected series of prophetic utterances, extending over several centuries ; suppose, further, that these utterances formed an integral part of the teaching of a line of remarkable men, who from age to age were the witnesses for righteousness to their nation, and laboured to elevate and refine its religion ; suppose, also, that the intimations, the foreshadowings, the prophetic hints and sketches of the future, which were bound up with their teaching, ultimately found a realization in a new and more advanced order of things, the establishment of which formed an important epoch in the development of the human race ; would not this remarkable combination of circumstances of the highest import to the world constitute a strong case to support the idea of a divine inspiration and mission ?’—(p. 26).

The mistake which, as it seems to us, Mr. Brownlow Maitland makes here, is in thinking that he can get the whole without the parts ; that he can have the general stream of prophetic utterance to which he makes appeal without also accepting (and therefore, of course, defending) specific utterances of a predictive character. He may be right, and we think he is right, in bringing forward the totality of the argument. It is only thus that its real strength can be estimated, and, in fact, a great injustice is done to the fact of prophecy when the entire series of instances which make it up is not brought forward. But then what Mr. B. Maitland thus offers with one hand he withdraws with the other. In one breath he says, I rest on the whole fact of prophecy, and not on isolated portions of it. In the next he qualifies his previous statement by saying, There are parts of this argument, as generally stated, *quasi* predictions, of which the prophetic character is doubtful. I must decline to defend these, or, at all events, to bring them forward. But this is playing fast and loose with the argument. A distinct and specific prediction differs from one in general terms, chiefly in this, that it can be more easily verified. And, therefore, we think Mr. B. Maitland mistaken when he supposes that he may lay aside the predictions most marked

and constantly insisted on, and yet claim an unbroken chain of prophetic utterances, or that, as he says on p. 89, 'the inference from their united testimony is not materially weakened.' As long as he is developing the argument from prophecy, we listen with profit and pleasure; when he begins to attenuate the chain of it by the withdrawal of a link here and there, we must suggest that he should leave that work to the sceptic. Indeed, Mr. B. Maitland seems partly conscious of this. 'In the interpretation of sacred prophecy,' he says, 'if we would catch its undertone and understand its mysterious hints, *nothing may be neglected*'—(p. 79). Very true, and we commend to his attention his own excellent rule.

*Charges at his Primary Visitation.* By JAMES RUSSELL, Lord Bishop of Ely. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

THIS is a document of importance, and will repay a careful study. It consists of two distinct Addresses: the former at a visitation of the cathedral, the first undertaken for 147 years, and at which therefore some want of familiarity with formalities (we do *not* mean on the part of the Bishop) was excusable. This address is chiefly interesting to the parties immediately concerned, but we may add that we fully concur with the Bishop when, in advocating the development of the Theological College, and the King's School, he draws from the existing circumstances the inference that 'Ely, if anything, must be a city of institutions.'

The second part was addressed to the Clergy and Churchwardens, and is of far wider interest. The Bishop, after a tribute as graceful as it was well deserved, to his predecessor, Bishop Harold Browne, goes on to give the usual statistics of the diocese; and inasmuch as no Bishop in these days can wholly avoid controversy, he then 'passes with reluctant feet' to the ritual question. And here he holds a middle path. On the one hand, his lordship points out that neither the vestments nor the eastward position are *necessary* to the expression of sacramental doctrine, which of course is true, not to say a truism. And he upholds the canonical appointment of Lord Penzance. He does not 'perceive how anything of additional character which he [Lord Penzance] may have acquired by the superadded confirmation of the Crown, can have diminished from that which he received by the exercise of the will of the Archbishop.' On the other hand, he lays down clearly and emphatically a very important principle, that by the abolition of all primary jurisdiction in the Bishops, and the creation of a new court of first instance, 'the Royal action, hitherto limited to the highest region of appeal in things spiritual, has now advanced into the region next below.'

Upon the whole, we must say that the Charge before us reflects with great fidelity the difficulty and perplexity which constitute the special trial of Churchmen at this time. We can hardly expect, or even wish, that it should be otherwise. Out of this conflict of principles will probably issue some new *modus vivendi* between the Church and the State. But the share of this generation will probably be the struggle only; it will be for the next to enter in and take

possession. We cannot but think that the principle to which recurrence is had here more than once, 'Do nothing without the Bishop,' a sound and Catholic principle; but there are practical difficulties in the application of it which will occur to all. The Bishop's concluding suggestions upon the Burials Question and upon cemeteries are of a novel character, and of considerable interest.

Lastly, we would commend to our readers' attention the Bishop's suggestion of conferring Deacon's orders two years sooner than is the rule at present, and lengthening the Diaconate proportionally.

*A Reply to Cardinal Manning's recently acknowledged Essay entitled 'Dr. Nicholson's Accusation of the Archbishop of Westminster.'*

By the Rev. A. NICHOLSON, L.L.D., Incumbent of Christ Church, Leamington. (London: Rivingtons.)

WE do not know whether it may remain in the recollection of our readers that a certain series of letters from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Nicholson appeared in the *Guardian*, during (if we do not mistake) the year 1873, commenting on a sermon preached by Archbishop Manning to recommend the devotion, or in which, at all events, he took occasion to defend the devotion, to the 'Sacred Heart.' These letters formed one part of a correspondence between the Archbishop and Dr. Nicholson, from which, after a time, the former retired, and it was carried on by his secretary, F. Guiron.

But now the *Tablet* newspaper began to discuss the subject further, in a series of articles of considerable acrimony towards Dr. Nicholson, accusing him of incredible ignorance or unqualified mendacity. 'Shallow, pretentious, impertinent, and to all appearance, insincere,' are a specimen of the literary amenities with which the *Tablet* plentifully assailed Dr. Nicholson, anonymously, of course. To all appearance he was crushed and buried, if not under the weight of the reasoning, at all events under the shower of adjectives. But the next stage of the affair is surprising, even after the revival of such a manner of controversy, which we, for our part, should have supposed had gone out with the Mohocks of the last century.

For these articles were all the while the production of Archbishop Manning himself; and as time went on, and Dr. Nicholson made no sign, the Archbishop prematurely supposed the matter at an end and himself triumphant. Therefore, he avowed the authorship, by including the five articles bodily in the collected edition of his *Miscellanies* (2 vols., Burns and Oates) published last year.

Since then, however, Dr. Nicholson came out with the brief pamphlet of forty pages, with the title of which we have headed this notice. Hitherto he had been fencing with a *simulacrum*—an anonymous somebody behind a mask. 'It now appears,' he says to the Cardinal Archbishop, in his reply, 'by your own acknowledgment, that you were continuing the controversy behind my back. You had your anonymous communications inserted in the *Tablet* as editorial articles. You were at the further pains to publish a letter to your secretary, conveying the impression that the matter had for you no remaining interest. This letter you introduced into one of your anonymous

articles as an important communication from "the Archbishop," which you said "F. Guiron had [has? REV.] given us leave to print."

The whole controversy is very curious indeed, and it should on no account be read without the final letter of Dr. Nicholson, which lies before us. We have read it more than once, and that with the coolest impartiality, for we need hardly say that our concern would be for the maintenance of the straight line of the Catholic Faith, rather than for the gaining of a polemical triumph. But in our judgment Dr. Nicholson maintains victoriously his original positions. No doubt the Archbishop does, as his antagonist allows, 'freely interperse orthodox terms and propositions in the vain endeavour to veil heresy under Catholic phraseology.'

But the essential principle which he maintains, and to which Dr. Nicholson severely holds him fast, viz. that the Sacred Heart of Jesus may be separated in idea from the Divine Humanity, in order to make it the object of especial devotion, clearly divides the Sacred Humanity, and *explicitates* (a part of it) from the Divinity for the purpose of adoration, which Thomassin states to be 'impious,' and which in principle is exactly what Nestorius did.

This is the reverse of creditable to a person in the Archbishop's position. But it is only one proof more of the deplorable extent to which modern Romanism has departed from the early Fathers and the standards of the Faith.

It is only justice to add on behalf of the other disputant, Dr. Nicholson, that his tone and language, though clear, cogent, and cutting, are courteous and gentlemanlike, as controversy should be, and therein are in creditable contrast to the outbursts of undignified vituperation in which the Archbishop has permitted himself to indulge.

*A Dictionary of English Philosophical Terms.* By FRANCIS GARDEN, M.A. (London: Rivingtons.)

THIS is a little book, and unpretending, but a very useful *tender* to more ambitious and more technical treatises. It not unfrequently happens that students of logic or philosophy find a difficulty in comprehending the terms of those branches of knowledge; and it must have happened to many to come upon one such term in an article, and to have been unable for the moment to say what was meant by it. Dictionary definitions of such words are commonly so brief as to be obscure. Such words Mr. Garden has set himself to define, and we need hardly say that he has defined intelligently and clearly. He is sometimes far too brief and inadequate, as in 'Realism.' Sometimes a subject is divided between two headings, and cross references not given, as in 'Substance,' and 'Person.' Sometimes we miss words we should have expected to find, as 'Syllogism,' 'Force.' But it is a praiseworthy attempt, and will be useful to many.



*The History, Constitution, and Character of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, considered as a Judicial Tribunal; especially in Ecclesiastical Cases, with special reference to the Right and Duty of its Members to declare their Opinions.* By W. F. FINLASON, Barrister-at-Law. (London: Stevens and Sons, and G. Bell and Sons.)

THE subject of this thin volume is one which is peculiarly interesting to Churchmen at the present time, seeing that the Church has been burdened with several great appeals already to the Judicial Committee, and is threatened with more. The author, too, is favourably known by more than one previous publication. In these pages he writes with legal formality indeed and verboseness, but nevertheless like a Churchman; and we can recommend these pages to such readers as desire a careful *résumé* of the law and of the facts relating to the highly important question named in the title. It is really a counsel's opinion writ large; and ought to be well considered by those who are the thinkers and the leaders among Churchmen.

The present Lord Chancellor holds, as is well known, the view that the Judicial Committee of Privy Council is not a Judicial Tribunal, but a consultative assembly. And in strict accordance with this view, he held in his controversy last year with the Lord Chief Baron, that the whole rule of rigid secrecy which has no doubt been the ancient practice of the Privy Council, applies.

The grave public inconvenience of a Court of Appeal, the judges in which are not free to declare their opinions if they dissent from the majority, is so evident that we cannot wonder to see the attention of an expert called to the legal question. Mr. Finlason has rendered a service to the Church, and indeed to the entire community, by this careful and painstaking sketch of the subject.

We may add a suggestion. He would probably hold that the publicity of the course of justice, and the right of judges to make known their opinions, whatever they might be, were matters of notoriety at Common Law. But might it not conceivably be held that publicity, though desirable, was not imperative? and if so, is it not an omission on Mr. Finlason's part, not to have supplied formal proof of this proposition?

*A Legal Guide for the Clergy.* With Appendix of Statutes. By R. DENNY URLIN, Barrister-at-Law. (London: Knight and Co.)

THIS is a manual of the day and for the day, not discursive, not antiquarian, but giving a useful sketch of the actual state of the law upon any given point, and index to authorities. 'Altar' is particularly comprehensive and good, so also 'Holy Communion.' 'Cope' is inadequate; 'Chasuble' is not found at all; nor 'Patron' nor 'Patronage,' though information relating to these is to be discovered under other heads. We imagine it will be new to many that among the privileges of the clergy is 'freedom from arrest on ordinary civil process' (p. 30). Surely this is obsolete?

*Why I am a Churchman. The Sequel to Why I am a Christian.*

By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, M.A., Rector of Brighstone.  
(London : W. Skeffington and Son.)

THE prevailing quality of this little work is *persuasiveness*. The successive chapters present the position of the Church of England with substantial force, and put the familiar arguments with a kindly and sympathetic tone, which will be likely to commend them to an unprejudiced reader. There are no *novelties* in the arguments, and it is not desirable there should be. But we should like a bolder and more confident tone here and there; as in the case of such apparently faltering sentences as that on p. 29: '*Until I am convinced of the contrary*, I hold this Church of England to be a portion [of the Catholic Church].' We know that it is only the respected author's habitual modesty of speech and of assertion that has prompted this turn of statement. But we think it a mistake here. Generally, we may say that the work is stronger against Dissenting than as against Roman error; while in fact, that department of the argument is quite as needful as ever in face of the Roman propagandism, ever on the watch around us to beguile unstable souls. Perhaps the respected author will add one or two more chapters in some future edition of his excellent little book.

*Practical Hints for Parochial Missions.* By REV. J. W. HORSLEY, M.A., and REV. N. DAWES, M.A. Revised and Prefaced by the REV. GEORGE BODY, M.A. (London : Longhurst.)

MISSIONS have now assumed a recognised and considerable place among our parish methods. And as the preparation and conduct of these is a matter of some complexity, requiring care and experience, many clergy who know something of these matters, and still more who know nothing, will welcome this well-written and most useful manual. We should recommend every parish clergyman to provide himself with a copy. The appendices are suggestive and valuable, giving lists of subjects for sermons, of devotional books for the missionary's own and for parish use, &c.

*Addington Venables, Bishop of Nassau: A Sketch of his Life and Labours for the Church of God.* By W. FRANCIS HENRY KING, M.A. (London : W. W. Gardner.)

THIS is a simple and brief but singularly touching record of a Bishop who lived a noble and self-denying life. If it were, as the author says, 'obscure,' it has none the less a worth and distinction all its own; and the Bishop has well deserved that his name should be placed side by side with those of Bishops Patteson and Field.

He was the son of Thomas Venables, who was private secretary to Lord Sidmouth and Sir Robert Peel, when First Lords of the Treasury. The two were joint godfathers to the child, and gave him their names. Had Sir Robert Peel lived, Mr. Venables would probably have followed a political career; but after Sir Robert's sudden death his thoughts turned to Holy Orders; and, after a brief residence at

Wells, was ordained to the curacy of Cuddesden, from whence he passed to St. Paul's, Oxford, or 'Jericho,' as it is locally called. How valuable his work was in that parish numbers can still testify. His biographer gives a very faithful and adequate idea of it, derived from some such sources, and worked up very well. From thence he went to his new duties as Bishop of Nassau.

His episcopate lasted twelve years. It was remarkable, not for any great material results attained during its course (for which, indeed, his poor and thinly-populated islands afforded no scope), as by the continual and steady growth of the Bishop in the respect and love of his people. The memoir shows him to us as faithful and assiduous in those long and tedious voyages by which alone the greater part of his scattered diocese could be reached, and as the courteous host and diligent student during his periods of residence at home. We could have wished, however, that it might have been shown in greater detail how well and wisely he steered his diocese through two great periods of trial—the one arising from the great pecuniary depression of the colony, terminating in the disestablishment of the Church, there, as always, sure to suffer; the other the destruction of so many churches and schoolhouses by the sudden violence of a tornado, we think, in 1870. The materials for a life of the Bishop were, we are told, very scanty. But to those who knew the man even this brief memorial will be sufficient to recall him to remembrance, and, we think, will be welcomed by all classes of Churchmen.

We trust that the widowed see of Nassau will not much longer remain without a Bishop to take up Bishop Venables's faithful work.

*Pius the Ninth. A Biography.* By FRANCIS HITCHMAN. (With a Portrait in Permanent Photography.) (London: Houlston and Sons.)

THIS is a book of the hour, and for the hour it is well enough. It would be absurd to judge the mere compilation of the moment, hurriedly drawn up to supply a sudden demand, by the standard according to which we justly estimate a serious and lengthy biography. Judged by this easy standard, it is a satisfactory book enough. Its speciality is, that it is a biography from the *liberal point of view*. It is outspoken in condemnation of Pius the Ninth's Ultramontane heresies. But it does his kindness of character and his pure morals full justice; it is fair without being laudatory; and as far as we have noticed, it is without material misstatement in fact, though it summarises the narrative to the extreme of brevity.

*Turkey in Europe.* By JAMES BAKER, M.A., Lieutenant-Colonel, Auxiliary Forces. Formerly 8th Hussars. (London, 1878.)

WHEN a terrible war is raging, it is natural to desire to know as much as possible of the character, condition, and resources of the antagonists. And therefore the publication of this volume is most seasonable, as giving the same minute information concerning Turkey which Mr. Wallace gave us last year about Russia. And for the

performance of the task which he has undertaken of instructing his countrymen on this subject, Colonel Baker has, like Mr. Wallace, the advantage of a minute personal acquaintance with the country, having not only travelled over the whole of it, over a great portion of it more than once, but having also a considerable estate in one of the southern provinces. His work well deserves the character of being an exhaustive account of both the country and the nation. He describes the people, the government; the state of its agriculture and manufactures; the character and extent of the general resources of the land; the great progress made of late years in education; the strength of the army and navy; the mode and amount of taxation; in short, the resources of every kind which the country possesses. And, as he was writing when war was imminent, he explains very lucidly, even to non-military readers, his idea of the strategy which was best calculated to enable the Turks to resist the invasion of the vastly superior force which the Russians could bring against them; and especially of the value of the mountains and of the fortresses as lines of defence; on which subject many of his remarks have been singularly verified by recent events. Of the people, apart from their government, he has formed a very favourable opinion. He has found them brave, courteous, honest, and humane, unless when excited by some sudden panic. Of the Government, his judgment is far less favourable, though the charges which he brings against it are of apathy, venality, and general neglect of duty, rather than of actual oppression or cruelty. Indeed, though it cannot be denied that in dealing with different religions, intolerance is so far the rule of government that the Christian part of the population does not in any province enjoy the same rights or privileges as the Mahometans, he nevertheless asserts, and brings abundant proof of the correctness of his assertion, that the Christians were neither persecuted by the Government nor regarded with ill-feeling by their Mahometan neighbours. On the contrary, he adds his testimony to the truth of the statements which have of late been so forcibly presented to the world, respecting the great prosperity which Bulgaria was enjoying till the 'intrigues of Russia interfered to spoil it.' And he explains with a precision of knowledge that must bring conviction to all but those who are determined not to be convinced, the 'means by which Russia has stirred up agitation and trouble throughout the country; and, working over a space of many years with one fixed and persistent policy, she has used with consummate skill the art of intrigue, and brought the unhappy country to its present state of misery' (p. 57).

One chapter is devoted to an account of the army and navy. The strength of the former *on paper* will surprise most of his readers, for it is given as 666,530 men; 'but it is hardly necessary for him to warn his readers that a paper army in Turkey is even more unreal in point of numbers than it is in other countries' (p. 295). And the defects in its organisation, and in the mode of supplying the troops, and the irregularity with which they are paid, are insufficient to neutralise a great part of its power; the greatest evil of all being, in

his judgment, the extreme incompetency of the officers of every grade. And, again, the bad opinion of them which he expresses has been abundantly borne out by the events of the recent campaign. The arms and war material generally he pronounces good, but there are no pontoon trains, and scarcely any of the fortresses could resist the artillery of the present day; while the forts of the Dardanelles are but half armed, and as yet, in an imperfect state. With respect to the navy, splendid as is its list of ships, he finds the same fault as with the army: the sailors are brave and loyal, but the officers, with the exception, of course, of those who have been trained in our service, are quite inefficient.

Some very interesting pages are devoted to an account of the state of education in some of the provinces; the most important consideration of all, if there is to be real reform and progress in the nation. In some districts, and especially in Bulgaria, great strides have recently been made, though they are owing rather to the well directed energy of a body of enlightened merchants than either to the civil government or to the Greek clergy. On the contrary, the Patriarch of the Greek Church was the most formidable enemy the cause of education had to encounter. As printing presses in the country were few, the merchants in question imported the books they required from foreign countries. But

'no sooner were they landed than the Patriarch instantly hurried to the Porte, and obtained the confiscation of all the Bibles and books, representing most artfully that these works being in the Slavic language was proof of Bulgarian sympathy with Russia, and that the importations were but the first act of rebellion. But the work was done, the books were in the hands of the people; and before they could be hunted up and destroyed, the desired effect was produced. A burst of indignation came forth from the people at the withdrawal of the only means of educating their children in their much loved vernacular, and the organised band of leaders stepped boldly forward and demanded their right to the mother tongue. Subscriptions were raised in all the district towns, and teachers were imported; . . . permission was obtained to establish schools' (p. 35);

and, the first step once made, the good work has proceeded so rapidly and so steadily, that though before 1850 it was difficult to find any one who could read or write, before the end of 1858 there were 110 schools; by 1865, 229 schools; and in 1870, 337 schools; besides one gymnasium or central college, with nearly 400 teachers and nearly 17,000 pupils. And from 1870 till the time when the Servian war and 'so-called Bulgarian rebellion broke out,' the progress was still more rapid.

One part of his subject, in which Colonel Baker naturally takes a great personal interest, since, as we have mentioned, he has bought an estate there, is the fertility of the land and the state of agriculture. And here again he complains, not of the intentional injustice, but of the apathy of the Government, and of its utter neglect of its duties. A single fact which he mentions is more condemnatory of it than pages of the most laboured denunciation could be. The

soil of a great part of the country he pronounces to be as rich as any in the world, but 'not half the land is cultivated' (p. 441), and all that is not is left free for squatters; any one being allowed, on the payment of a small fee, scarcely averaging a shilling an acre, to settle on any portion he may select, and build a cabin; the ground so pilfered becoming his own at the end of twenty years, provided he has regularly paid the tithe, and the other very light taxes to which property in Turkey is liable. And the cause why this vast quantity of land, which might enrich both people and Government, is thus left waste, is the neglect of the Government to provide means of communication. There are no canals, though the abundance of the water power in the country seems, as our Brindley said a century ago, provided by nature expressly to facilitate such works. There are scarcely any roads, and if one is made, it is sure in a few years to be suffered to fall into such a state of disrepair as to become impassable for wheeled carriages. The consequence is, that there is no mode of conveying the produce of the fields to market but that of placing it on the backs of pack-horses, a plan which increases the cost of transit at least sixfold what it ought to amount to. Yet, in one respect, this state of things offers, in Colonel Baker's eyes, one great inducement to emigrants to settle there, since land is at present to be purchased at a very low rate which, when the resources of the country are developed by a network of good roads and canals, will have its value increased tenfold. We mentioned that he had bought an estate, and he gives us the most minute account of his expenditure and receipts. The land was bought for about three guineas an acre. The necessary buildings, the price of tools and machinery bought in England, of one hundred horses and twenty cows, with all the other requisites for successful farming, amounted to as much more; so that for 10,000*l.* he became the owner of a well-stocked estate of 1,500 acres. The yearly expense of cultivation cost, in round numbers, 2,000*l.* The produce fetched 4,500*l.*, so that the 10,000*l.* of capital yields an income of 2,500*l.*, or 25 per cent. Sheep farming, for which portions of Macedonia are better calculated, is almost equally remunerative. And if these are the results of well directed industry while the Government does so little for the encouragement of its subjects, it is but reasonable to suppose, that if the promised reforms are ever carried out, the reward of the farmer's toil will be largely increased.

It is to the same universal apathy and indolence of the Government that Colonel Baker attributes also the insolvency which, more probably than any other result of its shortcomings, alienated Western Europe from the Turks. Captain Burnaby, in relating his ride through Armenia, reports that all the Eastern provinces are rich in mineral wealth of all kinds, which no one is at the trouble to extract from the soil. And Colonel Baker fully endorses his brother officer's statement, with the addition that parts of Thessaly and Macedonia are almost equally rich. And he is emboldened by facts which he conceives himself to have ascertained, to sketch out a plan by which he believes in a few years Turkey might put herself in a



position to pay the interest of her debt, and gradually to reduce the principal. We do not pretend to pronounce a judgment on the proverbially uncertain results of the miner's labours. But the English bondholders must be less sanguine than speculators usually are, if, as soon as peace re-establishes security, some attempt is not made to verify the anticipations of our gallant traveller.

Whatever may be the results of the war now, we trust, concluded, and whatever may be the changes in the constitution and government of the countries which make up Turkey in Europe, it is undeniable that recent events have attracted attention to them in a degree not known for centuries before; and that every circumstance and event which takes place in them will be for years watched by too severe a scrutiny to allow the interest excited by them speedily to die away. Every change in every country has eulogists prepared to extol, and critics resolved to disparage, its fruits. But those who desire to be able to form a dispassionate judgment of the changes which are destined to take place in Turkey, and who, as the foundation of their judgment of the future, desire to obtain an accurate acquaintance with the present condition of the country, will find, in Colonel Baker's unpretending volume, assistance which we know not where else they could obtain.

*Memoir of the Right Hon. William, second Viscount Melbourne.*

By W. M. TORRENS, M.P. 2 vols. (London, 1878.)

A BIOGRAPHY of one who for some years filled the proudest position that can be attained by a subject—that of prime minister of England—cannot fail to command attention. But we are sorry to say that very little of the interest which attaches to these volumes arises from the literary skill with which they are compiled. They are padded with numbers of irrelevant stories, some of which, though they are not correctly told, or at all events not as they have been related before, are so old that we cannot refuse our belief to them, while others are so new that we suspect readers in general will hardly believe them at all. As, for instance, that of the extraordinary conversation between the Regent and Lady Spencer, in which, according to Mr. Torrens, the Prince confessed that he and his brothers were all habitual liars, having been 'taught to equivocate by the Queen,' and requested Lady Spencer to provide the Princess Charlotte with a governess who should prevent her from falling into the same evil and most unroyal habit—(i. 157).

We will not say that Lady Spencer might have been usefully employed in also finding a tutor for Mr. Torrens; but many of his statements show a most surprising heedlessness in respect of facts, trivial perhaps, but also notorious, such as may well excuse us for doubting his accuracy as to others where the truth is not so easily ascertained. At the beginning of the work we meet with the following astonishing sentence. 'In 1790 William Lamb was entered at Eton. Among his classfellows were Charles Sumner, destined to become Archbishop of Canterbury; Charles Ellis, afterwards Lord Stuart de Rothsay (!!); Tullibardine, afterwards Duke of Athole,'

&c. &c. (i. 33). If Master Charles Sumner was at that time destined to become Archbishop of Canterbury, he affords an instance of fate having been baffled ; since he (who, if he was alive at all, must have been in his cradle) certainly never did attain the primacy, though his brother John, many years older than he, did. But no confusion between Christian names of brothers can account for the marvellous blunder which identifies Mr. Charles Ellis, afterwards Lord Seaford, with Charles Stuart, afterwards Lord Stuart de Rothsay. And the mention of 'Tullibardine' compels the remark that Mr. Torrens's habit of omitting all mention of the rank of those he names, however important as a proof of his familiarity with great men, is not in accordance with the custom of the best writers. They speak of Lord Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston, Lord Althorp, Lord Milton, Lord Folkestone ; but with Mr. Torrens they are all Lansdowne, Palmerston, Althorp, Milton, Folkestone ; and in the whole work the Duke of Wellington is almost the only Peer who is commonly distinguished by his title. Mr. Torrens is as careless about dates as about names. He tells us that Sheridan died in the autumn of 1818, when, in fact, the great orator and dramatist did die in July, 1816 ; and the mistake is the more singular because he also affirms that the introductory chapters of Moore's *Life of Sheridan* were contributed by Lord Melbourne (i. 141), a fact which no critic has ever suspected, and which, if it be correctly stated, it is not greatly to Mr. Moore's credit not to have acknowledged. With similar carelessness he places Byron's marriage in 1816, though a letter of Byron himself fixes it to January 2, 1815. Another peculiarity which a critic is bound to expose is Mr. Torrens's assumption of the privilege of coining new words to an extent which goes beyond the practice of the most inventive advertiser. We are treated to 'unhelpmate,' 'unexpected,' 'undiminishment,' and 'administrating' within a few pages ; and the use of substantives for adjectives in such phrases as 'the rhetoric art' is perhaps even more objectionable.

Still the subject is sufficiently interesting to enable the work to surmount these defects in style, care, and taste. Not, indeed, that Lord Melbourne can be placed in the front rank of those statesmen to whom at different times the government of this great nation has been entrusted. But, if ever anyone was so, he was *felix opportunitate*. For one who rose so high his official career was singularly brief. He was forty-eight years of age, and had been twenty-two years in Parliament, when Canning, apparently at the instigation of Huskisson, who was related to the Lamb family, offered him the post of Irish Secretary. Mr. Torrens claims for him the credit of having been deservedly popular in that ticklish office ; of having been affable, courteous, and accessible to all, which we can well believe. And it was in his favour, also, that he was known to be inclined to relieve the Roman Catholics from the disabilities which were regarded as the chief grievance of Ireland. But he remained in that country too short a time to leave any mark of his ministerial career. And the most remarkable circumstance connected with his tenure of office is that corruption and intrigue of all kinds were still so rife in every

department that he could not ensure the safety of his own letters to his superiors in England, but found that, if sent by the post, they were unsealed, and resealed ; or that, if entrusted to a despatch-box, the lock was picked, and the letter not replaced till it had been opened and read.

As it was as a friend of Huskisson that he had taken office, so when that statesman withdrew from the ministry of the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Lamb retired with him. And, in the course of the same summer, an event occurred which of itself must have removed him from Ireland ; the death of his father, and his own succession to the Peerage.

It may, however, be inferred that he had done well in Ireland from the circumstance (already mentioned by Sir H. Bulwer in his 'Life of Lord Palmerston') that in the summer of 1830 the Duke made more than one effort to tempt Lord Melbourne to rejoin him. The attempt failed, and the reason alleged by Lord Melbourne for rejecting an offer which, considering the circumstances under which he had parted from the Duke, he must have regarded as very flattering, was that the Duke refused to extend his invitation to Lord Grey. It was a very curious reason for him to advance, since the most notorious action of Lord Grey in recent years had been the violent philippic with which he had assailed Canning when that brilliant statesman became prime minister, and when Mr. Lamb was one of his colleagues.

But the evidence which it gave of the union of the majority of Huskisson's party with that section of the Whigs which was most deeply pledged to Parliamentary reform, prepared the public for his acceptance of the seals of the Home Office, when in the winter of the same year Lord Grey became prime minister. Mr. Greville, though a friend, records the prevailing opinion that the appointment was one of questionable wisdom, from the habitual idleness of the new Secretary of State. And, though, of course, Mr. Torrens does not agree with this censure, we cannot but think that he supplies many an incidental piece of evidence that the idea was not unfounded, though other facts show that he could not be charged with any gross neglect of the duties of his office. Undoubtedly, the three years which ensued supplied events sufficient to try the activity and courage of the ablest minister. There were formidable riots at Bristol and Nottingham ; apprehensions of similar outbreaks in more than one provincial town, and even in London itself. Warnings and counsels were freely tendered by all kinds of advisers, competent and incompetent. But we read with some amusement that, of these volunteer statesmen, the one on whose information and knowledge of the popular temper the Home Secretary was most inclined to rely, was an officious tailor, of the name of Place. Other advice was less willingly listened to ; 'it was not without a groan, and a certain amount of profane swearing' (i. 388), that even the recommendations of the *Times* were read, though at that time it was among the most furious and unscrupulous partisans of the ministry. Not indeed that these oaths implied any violent disapprobation.

The minister's unfortunate habit of swearing on all occasions, or on no occasion at all, was unfortunately so notorious as, unless common fame was more than usually false, to draw upon him, more than once, the admonition, or we might say the reproof, of his better conducted friends. But it affords another curious specimen of Mr. Torrens' taste, that he thinks a continual record of the bad practice eminently worth preserving as one of the most noticeable characteristics of his subject. There is not one on which he dwells with such gusto, referring to it over and over again with an evident feeling of amusement which it can hardly excite in those (and there still are some) who cherish an affectionate recollection of the man.

But when he was too much perplexed to find relief even in such ejaculations, he would, we are told, ask the Chief Clerk or the Under Secretary what on earth was to be done? and, when neither could tell, he would take refuge in his *dolce far niente*, a proverb which certainly no other minister ever translated so literally to serve as his own rule of conduct. 'Whenever you are in doubt,' he said, 'what should be done, do nothing' (i. 391).

If, however, he did not display any great energy in statesmanship, which indeed had never been expected of him, at the Home Office; he had shown that the general estimate of him was equally correct when it credited him with an amount of good temper, patience, and general amiability; qualities which were so marked that, when in the summer of 1833 Lord Grey was worried by the rash irregularities of some of his colleagues and the intrigues of others into a resignation of his post, they suggested to him the propriety of recommending Lord Melbourne to the King as the person best suited to keep together, as its head, a Cabinet which contained such jarring and unmanageable elements. And so Lord Melbourne, greatly to his own surprise, and not greatly to his delight, as Mr. Torrens assures us, found himself prime minister: to be ejected by the spontaneous act of the Sovereign himself before the end of the year; to be restored to office in the following spring; and to continue in it longer than any minister but four since the Revolution.

Singular as it may seem, his very reputation for indolence led the majority of the nation to acquiesce in his promotion. It had just gone through what has often been described as a revolution, though a peaceful one. And though already some restless spirits looked on what had been done as merely a lever by which to effect more, the more sober-minded desired rather a respite from agitation, an interval of rest which might afford time to estimate the results of the Reform Bill, and to judge by them whether it were to be regarded as a goal or as a stepping-stone. For a Government of vehement (in the opinion of some, even among its own members, of over-ardent) action, an administration of inactivity seemed what was most to be desired as its successor. And such Lord Melbourne's undoubtedly was.

Those who in the present day look on it as a reproach to a Government that it does not pass a multitude of new measures every

session, may with some advantage study the headings of the chapters in which Mr. Torrens relates the legislation during the six years of Lord Melbourne's second administration. Municipal reform and Postal reform are the only achievements which his biographer regards as deserving any special mention, though his adversaries acknowledged that in one most important way he did good service to the State. At the beginning of the third year of his ministry William IV. died; and Queen Victoria, then barely eighteen years of age, had necessarily much to learn of the principles and working of the constitution and of parliamentary government. For instruction on these subjects she naturally, during the earlier years of her reign, looked to the prime minister: and his extensive knowledge, his thorough fairness and candour, and his high sense of political honour, eminently qualified Lord Melbourne to act as a guide such as Her Majesty required. In one point only did he give a pretext for saying that he had misled his Royal mistress. We allude to the celebrated Bedchamber question of 1839; a topic which we need not reopen here, as every writer of every party who has dealt with it, except Mr. Torrens, even the Radical historian Miss Martineau, has pronounced the line which he took utterly indefensible. And indeed, his own subsequent assertion, not that he had been right, but that he could reckon up two hundred friends who would have been ruined if he had confessed himself wrong, and had consequently resigned his office, may be taken as an admission that he could not in his cooler moments justify the advice which he had given. *Habemus confitentem reum.*

The most striking transactions of his ministry after this time were the operations on the Syrian coast, which he left chiefly to Lord Palmerston's management. But the country was becoming gradually alive to the weakness of the administration in every part, and most especially in finance, in which their blunders were incessant, and were exposed by Sir R. Peel, who was a financier above everything, with merciless dissection. The budget was rejected; a vote of want of confidence in the ministers was carried, and when they dissolved Parliament in consequence, so many of their supporters, and some even of their own body, were unseated, that it created no surprise that in the debate on the address they were defeated by large majorities in both Houses, and had no choice but to resign.

With his resignation, though he was not an old man, Lord Melbourne's public life may be said to have ended. Indeed Mr. Torrens dismisses the last seven years of his life in one very short chapter, the accuracy of which has been severely questioned by some of those whose memories carry them back so far. If the picture which it draws be correct, it is not greatly to the credit of either the statesman or his friends. It represents them as treating with neglect one to whom their party certainly owed much for the tact and temper with which he had so long kept them together when the leaders were quarrelling among themselves, and in office after the nation was tired of them. And it describes him as fretful and

desponding, brooding over the slights put upon him in undignified discontent. We confess that we think those who deny the truth of this portrait have probability on their side, and that the genial social qualities which had always been his most prominent characteristics must to the end have preserved the affection of his old friends, even if his acuteness of judgment and steady adherence to his party had not still commanded their respect. Even now, when thirty years have passed since his death, we ourselves must still feel that the memory of these endowments has not wholly lost its influence, and though we cannot give any high praise to the statesman or the minister, we cannot reconcile it to our feelings to say a harsh word of the fair-dealing, accomplished, honourable gentleman.

*History of the English People.* By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A.  
Vol. I. With Eight Maps. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

THE chorus of praise with which Mr. Green's earlier *School History of England* was received on all sides has emboldened him to continue his researches, and to present the result of them in an altered form. The present history is strictly a history 'of the English People'—i.e., the author either leaves out altogether, or dismisses with a mere mention, entire tracts of history which either affected but slightly, or did not affect at all, the fortunes of the great mass of the English population. Of such are, e.g., the Crusades, or the prolonged contest between the Pope and the King respecting investitures. This procedure is, of course, philosophically questionable, for it would not be difficult to show that each of these events influenced the fortunes of England; but it is perfectly intelligible, and Mr. Green has, by *isolating* our English story, and confining himself strictly to its course, succeeded in producing so brilliant and vigorous a narrative of his subject, that we can but take what he has presented to us with thanks and admiration, and forbear to wish that he had done otherwise than he has. If not an English history, it is, at all events, the best of commentaries upon the English history that our generation has seen.

*China: A History of the Laws, Manners, and Customs of the People.*

By JOHN HENRY GRAY, M.A., LL.D., Archdeacon of Hongkong.  
Edited by WILLIAM GOW GREGOR. In Two Volumes. With One Hundred and Forty Illustrations. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

WERE we to say that this lengthy work exhibits any particular merit in a literary point of view we should be exaggerating. It is a plain, unpretending narrative, far too lengthy ever to be popular (it extends to two octavo volumes of about four hundred pages each), but which compose a perfect encyclopædia or treasury of Chinese institutions. The author plods laboriously through the subjects of government, religion, education, marriage, and divorce, and so on. Upon each subject he gives an industrious *résumé* of the facts, and gives an opinion founded very often upon personal observation, and which is invariably marked by intelligence and largeness of view. Notwithstanding the prevalent cruelty



of punishments, the bribery which weighs down the machine of government, and other blots upon the national character, Dr. Gray speaks highly of the Chinese. 'Notwithstanding conditions,' he says, 'so little favourable to the development of civil and social virtues, the Chinese may be fairly characterised as a courteous, orderly, industrious, peace-loving, sober, and patriotic people.' The darker shades in the picture he does not, however, overlook or gloss over when occasion leads him to them. And there is no question that this is a people which it behoves us to know. China, teeming with a population of marked industry and imitative power, will some day form an important factor in the Asia of the future; and Europeans will find it wise to make themselves acquainted with it betimes. The work before us will afford them the means of doing so. The letter-press is enlivened by numerous wood-cuts by Chinese artists in all the quaint style of their art. Considering the rage which prevails now for everything Oriental, these wood-cuts ought to be the making of the book.

*Walks in London.* By AUGUSTUS J. C. HARE. In two volumes. (London: Daldy, Isbister and Co.)

THOSE who have read *Walks in Rome*, and they are many, will know what to anticipate in the work before us, and we feel sure that they will not be disappointed. There have been unnumbered books by all sorts of people on the great city, but this is surely the most charming book about London, and all its little known beauties of architecture, and all its treasures of art, and its manifold and priceless historical associations, which has ever been penned. It is the work of one who is himself a scholar and an artist, and hence is something infinitely beyond the mere guide-book. 'I have tried,' he says, 'to give such details as may suggest new lines of inquiry to those who care to linger and investigate.' We may think that he somewhat exaggerates when he declares—

'Scarcely any man in what is usually called "society" has the slightest idea of what there is to be seen in our own great metropolis, because he never looks, or still more, perhaps, because he never inquires, and the architectural and historical treasures of the city are almost as unknown to the West End, as the buried cities of Bashan, or the lost tombs of Etruria. Strangers, also, especially foreigners, who come perhaps with the very object of seeing London, are inclined to judge it by its general aspects, and do not stay long enough to find out its more hidden resources. They never find out that the London of Brook Street and Grosvenor Street, still more the odious London of Tyburnia, Belgravia, and South Kensington, is as different to the London of our great-grandfathers as modernised Paris is to the oldest town in Brittany, and dwellers in the West End do not know that they might experience almost the refreshment and tonic of going abroad in the transition from straight streets and featureless houses to the crooked thoroughfares half-an-hour off, where every street has a reminiscence, and every turn is a picture'—(p. xiv.).

And some of us may have a private opinion that London, with its smoke and soot, its frequent fogs and ceaseless noise, is better to

VOL. VI.—NO. XI.

T

visit than to live in. But whether inhabitant or visitor, everyone who takes up Mr. Hare's volumes will, we predict, be delighted with them. Not a page but tempts the reader onwards, and the book is one which will be permanently popular. We should add that it is beautifully printed, and that the many and picturesque woodcuts give just the elucidation which the text continually requires.

*Saint Athanase. Étude Littéraire.* Par EUGÈNE FIALON. 8vo.  
(Paris : Thorin.)

M. EUGÈNE FIALON has published on the life of S. Athanasius a *brochure* which we heartily recommend to all readers interested in ecclesiastical history ; it is an excellent monograph, soberly written from the best sources, and showing on the part of the author real scholarship. M. Fialon carefully disclaims any pretension to decide or even to dwell on points of theology, but this was quite impossible in dealing with the career of such a man as S. Athanasius, and notwithstanding the title, *Étude Littéraire*, which figures on the title-page, we find ourselves almost immediately, *à propos* of the schools of Alexandria, transported in the midst of metaphysical problems, and of considerations on the relative influence of Judaism, Neoplatonism, and Christianity. The first chapter of the work is taken up by a very lucid and complete sketch of the state of Alexandria before the outbreak of the Arian controversy. M. Fialon shows us the Egyptians, the Jews, and the Greeks contributing to the development of a civilisation which made of the seaport town one of the intellectual centres of the world ; he points out the evil side of this exuberance of free thought, and describes the Christians gradually accustoming themselves to rationalising tendencies, which produced in the one direction the heresy of Sabellius, and, in the other, that of Arius.

The biography of Arius himself and the discussion of Arianism occupy the second chapter. M. Fialon, in dealing with the topic, takes up his position at the strictly orthodox standpoint ; and he exposes with great sagacity the vices of a system which, while it gave up the distinctive features of Christianity, failed to satisfy the aspirations and wants of fallen man. It is well known that the history of the Arians is one of the most celebrated works of the great archbishop. Our author reviews it in detail, shows that its character is that of a pamphlet, and places it in the class of those *secret books* which occurred frequently during the fourth century, and which had their *raison-d'être* in the hostile dispositions of the secular power. Similarly, towards the end of the religious wars in France, a veteran of the Protestant armies, equally remarkable as a writer and a soldier, Agrippa d'Aubigné, related in his *Histoire Universelle* the struggle of which he had been one of the heroes. The *Histoire Universelle*, proudly dedicated to 'posterity,' was meant for the public ; but side by side with it d'Aubigné printed a secret history, intended for circulation exclusively amongst the members of the Huguenot party, and exposing to the scorn of his fellow-religionists what he designated as the treachery of Henry IV. and of

the old leaders of the French Reformation. M. Fialon compares the history of the Arians to this pamphlet of Madame de Maintenon's grandfather, and shows that it was as impossible for Athanasius to be strictly impartial as it was twelve centuries later for Agrippa d'Aubigné.

The question of monachism is another interesting one, which naturally suggests itself in connexion with the life of S. Athanasius. M. Fialon examines it in the ninth chapter of his book. It would be wrong, he says, to suppose that the love of solitude was at the time of the prelate an exceptional case, and that S. Anthony's example had only a few enthusiastic imitators. A society which has exhausted all the enjoyments of life without finding any satisfaction in them, a civilisation essentially based upon materialism of the grossest kind, and which has no aspirations after higher motives, must necessarily end in an ascetic reaction, and we may say that the solitude of Nitria and of the Thebaid was the natural outcome of the luxury and licentiousness of the capital of the world. With reference to the fantastic descriptions which occupy so important a place in the life of S. Anthony, M. Fialon has the following remark : 'Athanasie n'eût été ni de l'antiquité, ni de son temps, ni Chrétien, s'il se fût refusé de croire à l'existence de l'esprit du mal, à sa présence dans le monde et à son action sur les hommes ; mais il n'eût été qu'une vulgaire intelligence, s'il n'eût eu de cet ennemi de l'homme une idée plus haute et plus philosophique que celle de la multitude.' S. Athanasius, he continues, did not believe in the bodily appearances which surrounded the monk ; he looked upon them merely as dreams conjured up by the imagination, but at the same time he believed in the existence of the prince of evil, and in the terrible reality of the temptations by which the sons of men are so beset.

The eleventh chapter of M. Fialon's work is the one where the literary merits of S. Athanasius are specially considered and appreciated. The Egyptian element of intellectual culture, he observes, had no influence upon him ; it had, indeed, never affected in the slightest degree the Hellenic mind. The citizen of Athens or of Corinth, for whom light and life were everything, could have no sympathy with a psychological tendency which, on the contrary, seemed to revel in the thought of death as of the only entrance to true happiness. S. Athanasius in this respect was essentially Greek. If, for the purpose of combating the Neoplatonists and Gnostics he studies the religion of Egypt, it is merely as a polemist. None of his writings show that he understood in the least the grand conceptions and the undoubted elements of divine truth which are to be found on the monuments of Thebes and of Luxor. Like all his Greek contemporaries, S. Athanasius was equally enthusiastic about the honour of his national literature, and about the eternal truths of Christianity. As our author well remarks, Homer was to be found on their study-table side by side with a copy of the Gospels. Bernard de Montfaucon has given in the Benedictine edition of the works of S. Athanasius, a list of the expressions borrowed by the

prelate from the Alexandrine dialect. M. Fialon enumerates some of the most characteristic : he then shows how much S. Athanasius was indebted to Plato and to Demosthenes, printing in parallel columns a few quotations from the *Pro Coronâ* on the one side, and from the *Apologia ad Constantium* on the other. By way of appendix to the volume we have the French translation of the *Apologia* itself, and also of the discourse which the archbishop composed in justification of his flight. The whole *brochure*, we repeat, is well worth the careful attention of historical students and of persons interested in Patristic literature.

*Étude sur le Liber Pontificalis.* Par M. l'Abbé DUCHESNE. 8vo.  
(Paris : Thorin.)

THE French Government, as our readers may perhaps know, supports both at Athens and in Rome establishments destined to train antiquarians, and to encourage, in various ways, historical and archaeological pursuits. The results accomplished by these two learned seminaries have been most satisfactory, and we would notice especially the publication of a review or journal containing monographs on subjects connected both with secular and ecclesiastical literature. The *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* has already won for itself a high position in the list of periodicals devoted to scientific questions, and the introductory fasciculus, containing an excellent and exhaustive essay on the *Liber Pontificalis*, deserves a brief mention here. The collection of biographies known under that name has very frequently occupied the attention of critics ; Baronius, Possevino, Ciampini, and Pertz, among others, may be named as having endeavoured to settle the numerous problems bearing upon the authorship, the date, and the importance of the work. That the *Liber Pontificalis* is of great value as illustrating the history of Rome and of the Papal See during the Middle Ages can scarcely be doubted ; the light it throws on Christian art and archaeology, and on the topography of the Eternal City, is considerable ; but the authority which it has a right to claim is still doubtful, notwithstanding all that has been written on the subject. M. l'Abbé Duchesne begins by saying that in order to judge accurately the worth of any historical document, we should determine, 1st, the text ; 2nd, the date ; 3rd, the sources ; and he then examines minutely the *Liber Pontificalis* from this threefold point of view. When we tell our readers that the MSS. of this compilation are 110 in number, ninety-eight of which are analysed by M. l'Abbé Duchesne with great detail, we shall have given them a slight idea of the thoroughness of the disquisition before us. The principal conclusions arrived at may be stated as follows. The *redaction* of the *Liber Pontificalis* was done about the year 514, the author being an inferior clerk of very poor literary talent, and who, on the occasion of the dispute between Symmachus and Laurentius, took up his pen in defence of the former. The sources from which these biographies have been compiled are numerous, and

many of them are still unknown ; but the apocryphal writings existing at the commencement of the sixth century seem to have supplied the greater part of the details put together by the historian. As M. l'Abbé Duchesne observes, it is perfectly astonishing that an author who undertook to write the lives of the Popes during the first five centuries of the Church should have neglected to consult monuments easily accessible, and an acquaintance with which was absolutely indispensable ; yet such is really the case, and as a natural consequence the *Liber Pontificalis*, notwithstanding its archæological and topographical importance, has very little authority if we consider it as a contribution to the history of the Church. The notices referring to the sixth and seventh centuries are the only ones which may be trusted, because they have the value of contemporary documents, and all the disciplinary and liturgical enactments recorded show, at any rate, what were the usages of the Roman Church at that epoch.

*Job et l'Égypte, le Rédempteur et la Vie future dans les Civilisations primitives.* Par l'Abbé VICTOR ANCESSI. 8vo. (Paris : Leroux.)

M. l'Abbé VICTOR ANCESSI, already known as an excellent Semitic scholar, now comes forward as an interpreter of Scripture, and applies in the most ingenious manner his acquaintance with Egyptian archæology to the elucidation of the Book of Job. The drift of the work he has recently published may be briefly stated as follows. The higher we go back into history, the more clearly we perceive in the various forms of heathenism the remains of a tradition vouchsafed by the Almighty and which embodied the cardinal truths of revealed religion—the doctrine of the fall, of a mediatorial sacrifice, of a future life, and of a final judgment. These great verities are especially apparent in the theological system of the ancient Egyptians, and we may boldly affirm that the mythological conceptions of that remarkable people at the earliest period of their history were all designed to bring vividly before the mind of men the chief doctrines of our faith.

Now, if we turn to the Book of Job and study its contents with a little attention, we cannot fail to be struck by the resemblance it shows with the theological teaching to be found in the papyri, hieroglyphic remains, and other monuments of Egypt. These wrecks from the land of the Pharaohs form a perpetual commentary on the sacred text, and the personage of Osiris throughout the various circumstances of his birth, his life, and his duties as redeemer-judge of the dead, is evidently a foreshadowing of the Saviour of mankind. These facts are the more noteworthy because the inspired author of the Book of Job, although perfectly acquainted with Egyptian civilisation and Egyptian thought, wrote from an independent standpoint ; and we have thus an additional proof of the argument so powerfully maintained by Tholuck and other divines—viz. that every scheme of mythology has retained an element of religious truth more or less distinct.

The ability with which M. l'Abbé Ancessi develops his propositions, his eloquent denunciation of the modern forms of unbelief, and the amount of knowledge displayed in his volume, can scarcely be overrated; the philological studies which had hitherto engrossed his attention are turned here to excellent use, and he is thoroughly conversant not only with the most recent results of Egyptology but with the mysteries of Semitic lore.

As a religious and philosophical treatise, the book is really the most valuable and complete work of the kind that has appeared in the history of the Church. The doctrine is not only sound, but it is also very clear and simple, and it is presented in a manner that is both attractive and convincing. The author's style is elegant and his arguments are powerful. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore.

As a religious and philosophical treatise, the book is really the most valuable and complete work of the kind that has appeared in the history of the Church. The doctrine is not only sound, but it is also very clear and simple, and it is presented in a manner that is both attractive and convincing. The author's style is elegant and his arguments are powerful. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore.

M. l'Abbé Ancessi is known as an excellent scholar, and his work is now being translated into English. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore. The author's style is elegant and his arguments are powerful. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore.

Now if we turn to the book of Job, and study its contents with this attention, we cannot fail to be struck by the resemblance it bears with the theological teaching to be found in the Bible. The book of Job is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore. The author's style is elegant and his arguments are powerful. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church and to the study of Semitic lore.